00029873

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 20 February, 2016

00029873

# CONTENTS

OF

# THE FOURTH VOLUME.

---

## BOOK IV.

ATTIC PERIOD.

### CHAPTER I.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ATTIC PERIOD.

1. Comparative view of the present and the past periods.—2. Distinctive characteristics of the Attic period. The Athenians deficient in the imaginative faculty. Altered positions of Athens and Sparta in regard to polite culture.—3. Causes of the change. The Athenians deficient in inventive genius; and in musical talent. Decline of elegant culture in Sparta.—4. Political vicissitudes of Greece during the Attic period. —5. General view of Greek literature from 560 to 510 B.C. Pisistratus. His literary circle. The Pisistratidæ. Polycrates of Samos. Backward state of Attic literature during the "Tyranny." Poetry and prose flourish in the Ionian colonies.—6. General view of Greek literature from 510 B.C. to the close of the Peloponnesian war in 404 B.C. Poetry. Prose literature.—7. General view of Greek literature from 404 B.C. to the close of the Attic period.—8. State of education in Greece during the Attic period. Schools and schoolmasters. Libraries. Book trade.—9. Patrons of literature. [Pisistratidæ. Polycrates.] Pericles.—10. His connexion with Aspasia. Hiero of Syracuse. The Dionysii. The Macedonian monarchs - Page 1

## CHAP. II.

ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION.

1. First essays in prose writing long precede a popular prose literature. Laws. Rhetræ of Lycurgus. Draco. Solon. Peloponnesian archives. —2. Rise of popular prose composition. Cadmus. Pherecydes. Acusilaus. Eumelus. Aristeas. Epimenides. — 3. Restriction of early Greek metrical history to mythical subjects.—4. Causes of that restriction. Similar restriction of earliest prose history. First application of prose to philosophical subjects. — 5. Geography the mother of authentic history. Aristeas of Proconnesus. Anaximander and Hecatæus of Miletus. Scylax. — 6. Genealogical literature. First essays in authentic history. Charon of Lampsacus Other early historians. — 7. Greek technical chronology. Earliest chronologers. Charon of Lampsacus. Hellanicus. Olympic register. — 8. Definition and origin of the Olympic era. Hippias. Aristotle. Timæus. — 9. Olympiad of Corœbus; Olympiad of Iphitus and Lycurgus. Identity of the two eras.—10. Philosophical literature. Its slow progress.—11. Rhetoric. Theagenes of Rhegium. Rhapsodists. Sicilian masters. Sophists. Definition and character of. — 12. Gorgias. Protagoras. Prodicus. Hippias. Early Attic orators. Thrasymachus. Theodorus. Grammatical works. — 13. Miscellaneous prose literature. Fable. Æsop. Other branches of popular prose. — 14. Greek prose style. Style as dependent on dialect. Early Ionic prose. Its variety of usage. — 15. Attic prose. — 16. Style as dependent on structure and composition. "Sententious" style. — 17. "Periodic" style. Gorgias. Lysias. Perfection of Attic style. Later vicissitudes of Ionic style. A defect of the classical Attic style - - - Page 48

## CHAP. III.

HISTORIANS PRIOR TO HERODOTUS.

Part I. *Historians flourishing prior to the Peloponnesian war.*

1. Early fabulous or apocryphal writers. Acusilaus. His genealogical work. His version of the legend of Troy.—2. Scylax of Caryanda. Hecatæus of Miletus. His age and character. —3. His Periodus or Description of the Earth.—4. Arrangement of its contents. —5. Countries omitted or neglected. Other characteristics of his geographical research.—6. His genealogical work. His dialect and style. Dionysius of Miletus. —7. Charon of Lampsacus. His age and works. Materials supplied by them to Herodotus. His style. — 8. Xanthus of Lydia.

His Lydian history. His other reputed works.—9. Hippys of Rhegium. His works. His style. Deïochus of Proconnesus. Melesagoras. Eudemus of Paros. Democles of Phygela. Simonides of Ceos. Xenomedes of Chios - - - - - - Page 131

Part II. *Historians flourishing during the Peloponnesian war.*

10. Pherecydes. His age and birthplace. His Archæologia.—11. His system of mythology. His style.—12. Antiochus of Syracuse. His notice of Rome.—13. Stesimbrotus of Thasos. His memoirs of Athenian statesmen. His character of Cimon, and of Pericles.—14. Ion of Chios. His prose works. His character of Pericles, and of Cimon.—15. His style.—16. Herodorus of Heraclea. His Life of Hercules. His Argonautica. His composition and style. His other works.—17. Hellanicus of Lesbos. His age. List of his works.—18. His Deucalionia: Phoronis: Atlantis.—19. His Atthis: Æolica: Lesbica: Troïca: Persica: Argive Priestesses: Carneonicæ.—20. His apocryphal works. His knowledge of the Latin tongue. His style. Damastes of Sigeum - - - - - - 182

## CHAP. IV.

### HERODOTUS: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

1. Herodotus the Homer of prose history.—2. His autobiographical notices.—3. Other notices of his life. His Halicarnassian nativity. His settlement at Thurium, and its imputed causes. Epoch of his birth.—4. Tradition of his recital of his work at Olympia. Historical objections to that tradition.—5. Its intrinsic improbability.—6. His work rose but slowly in popular estimation. Tears of Thucydides. Other supposed public recitals at Corinth, Thebes, Athens.—7. The Assyrian history of Herodotus. His death and character - - 241

## CHAP. V.

### HERODOTUS: HIS WORK, AND ITS MATERIALS.

1. Epitome of the text.—2. Research of Herodotus. How to be critically estimated. Definition of the Greek term Ἱστορίη, History. Different kinds of historical evidence.—3. Period of history treated by Herodotus. His neglect of the mythical age. His historical sources.—4. Previous historians. Hecatæus. Xanthus.—5. Charon of Lampsacus. Hippys. Antiochus. Stesimbrotus. Hellanicus. Geographers.—6. Monumental records. Oral testimony.—7. Mythical legend, rules for appreciating its historical value.—8. Application of those

rules to the narrative of Herodotus. — 9. Mythological mechanism of early prose history. Life of Crœsus. Death of Atys. Crœsus on the pile. Battle of Thyrea. — 10. Foreign history of Herodotus, and its sources. Assyrian History. — 11. Median History. — 12. Egyptian History. — 13. Sudden transition from mythical to real in his Egyptian annals. Blending of Egyptian and Greek mythology. Geographical research of Herodotus - - - - - Page 276

## CHAP. VI.

### HERODOTUS: HIS TREATMENT OF HIS MATERIALS.

1. Merits and defects of Herodotus as a historical authority. To be estimated in the spirit of his age. — 2. His religion and superstition. — 3. Influence of his superstition on his judgement. Oracles. Omens and prodigies. Dreams. — 4. His theories of interpretation. Direct interposition of the gods. His reserve concerning the "Mysteries." — 5. His theory of special Nemesis. Crœsus. Cambyses. Cleomenes. — 6. Murder of the Persian envoys. Xerxes and Artabanus. — 7. His love of the marvellous. Persian skull. Bald men and goat-footed men. His theory of the marvellous. — 8. Extremities of the earth. Gold regions. Marvels of India. Ethiopia. Hyperboreans. Arabia. Libya. Eccentric customs. — 9. Impositions practised on Herodotus. — 10. His excursive anecdotes and historical gossip. Corinthian history and court scandal. — 11. Solon. Sparto-Messenian wars. Cyrene. Affairs of Samos. — 12. His spirit of hyperbole. Expedition of Xerxes. — 13. His self-contradictions. The battle of Marathon. Ignorance of the Greek mariners. Persian ignorance of Greece. Egyptian eccentricity. — 14. Claims of Herodotus to rank as a critical historian. Scythian expedition of Darius. Estimate of distance by days' journeys. — 15. Estimate of time by generations, and by reigns of kings. Want of a standard chronological era. Other numerical anomalies. Battle of Thermopylæ. — 16. Invasion of Egypt by Cambyses. Walls of Babylon. — 17. Persian love of democracy. — 18. Historian's geographical criticism. Circumnavigation of Africa. Caspian sea. Changes of seasons. Rise of the Nile. — 19. His philological criticism. His mythological criticism. — 20. His impartiality. His character of the Persians. — 21. His imputed favour to the Athenians, and injustice to the Corinthians. — 22. His judgement of the Thessalians, Argives, Thebans, minor Greek states. — 23. Antagonism of Thebes and Athens. "Malignity" of Herodotus - - - - - 350

## CHAP. VII.

HERODOTUS: HIS COMPOSITION AND STYLE.

1. Characteristics of the historian's subject. — 2. His principal narrative and episodes. — 3. General harmony of their epic combination. — 4. Inappropriate or misplaced episodes. — 5. Concentration of the action on the affairs of Greece. Close of the narrative; its merits and defects. Existing subdivision of the text. — 6. Delineation of character. — 7. Cyrus. Cambyses. Darius. Xerxes. — 8. Crœsus. Common or conventional traits of character. Amasis. — 9. Hellenic character. The Athenians. Their disinterested patriotism. Their humanity. Their levity. — 10. The Spartans. Their Macchiavellian selfishness. Their military prowess. Anti-Attic feeling of the confederacy. — 11. Individual Greek characters. Themistocles. Cleomenes. Periander. — 12. Dramatic element of the historian's style. Speeches. — 13. Dialogue. — 14. His descriptive powers. Battle of Marathon. — 15. His language in structure and dialect. Parallel of Homer - - - - - - - Page 451

---

# APPENDIX.

App. A. On the religious intolerance of the Athenians - - 519

App. B. On the Ionic dialect of Herodotus - - - 523

App. C. On the geography of Hecatæus, with map - - 529

App. D. On the Periodus of Hecatæus - - - - 530

App. E. On the Lydiaca of Xanthus - - - - 531

App. F. On a passage of Ion of Chios - - - - 533

App. G. On the age of Herodotus — the revolt of the Medes — and Amyrtæus - - - - - - - 534

App. H. On the Olympic lecture of Herodotus - - - 539

App. J. On the self-contradictions of Herodotus - - 540

App. K. On the mythical details of the battle of Thermopylæ - 542

App. L. On the walls of Babylon - - - - 546

App. M. On the hypothesis that the history of Herodotus is an unfinished work - - - - - - 547

Page

App. N. On the awards of martial Aristia by the Greek confederacy - - - - - - - - 548

App. O. On the Athenian charge at the battle of Marathon - 549

App. P. On a point of Greek military tactics - - - 550

App. Q. Parallel phrases in Herodotus and Homer - - 551

---

## PLATE.

Map of the World according to Hecatæus - *to face page* 529

A

# CRITICAL HISTORY,

&c.

## BOOK IV.

### ATTIC PERIOD.

### CHAP. I.

### GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ATTIC PERIOD.

1. COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE PRESENT AND THE PAST PERIODS. — 2. DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ATTIC PERIOD. THE ATHENIANS DEFICIENT IN THE IMAGINATIVE FACULTY. ALTERED POSITIONS OF ATHENS AND SPARTA IN REGARD TO POLITE CULTURE. — 3. CAUSES OF THE CHANGE. THE ATHENIANS DEFICIENT IN INVENTIVE GENIUS; AND IN MUSICAL TALENT. DECLINE OF ELEGANT CULTURE IN SPARTA. — 4. POLITICAL VICISSITUDES OF GREECE DURING THE ATTIC PERIOD. — 5. GENERAL VIEW OF GREEK LITERATURE FROM 560 TO 510 B. C. PISISTRATUS. HIS LITERARY CIRCLE. THE PISISTRATIDÆ. POLYCRATES OF SAMOS. BACKWARD STATE OF ATTIC LITERATURE DURING THE "TYRANNY." POETRY AND PROSE FLOURISH IN THE IONIAN COLONIES. — 6. GENERAL VIEW OF GREEK LITERATURE FROM 510 B. C. TO THE CLOSE OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR IN 404 B. C. POETRY. PROSE LITERATURE. — 7. GENERAL VIEW OF GREEK LITERATURE FROM 404 B.C. TO THE CLOSE OF THE ATTIC PERIOD. — 8. STATE OF EDUCATION IN GREECE DURING THE ATTIC PERIOD. SCHOOLS AND SCHOOLMASTERS. LIBRARIES. BOOK TRADE. — 9. PATRONS OF LITERATURE. [PISISTRATIDÆ. POLYCRATES.] PERICLES. — 10. HIS CONNEXION WITH ASPASIA. HIERO OF SYRACUSE. THE DIONYSII. THE MACEDONIAN MONARCHS.

1. In the early volumes of this work, the vicissitudes of the Grecian family of tongues have been traced from its remote Indo-Pelasgic origin, down to the settlement of its noblest branch as a distinct language

Comparative view of the Attic and the preceding periods.

in the region where it afterwards so brilliantly flourished. We have seen how, in the legends of the Æolo-Thracian sages, were shadowed forth the first successful essays of the Hellenic nation in those elementary styles of poetry and music which form the foundation of all polite literature; and how, in the different tribes of that nation, were formed those distinctions of character and dialect, which in every age constitute so important a feature in the genius of Hellenism. We have marked the spirit of local emulation among those tribes, fostering a corresponding spirit of heroic adventure; which afterwards, by a nobler impulse of national feeling, was directed towards great common enterprises against rival nations, resulting in extensive schemes of conquest and colonial settlement. We have seen how the minstrelsy in which those enterprises were celebrated, was matured from the fugitive ballad into the heroic Epopee; and how, under the influence of an opposite train of social causes, this highest style of poetical art, after having been carried by one master genius to perfection, gradually languished and decayed. We have, however, also seen, that this deterioration of Greek Epic style was but a prelude to a no less genial, though less expansive exercise of the poetical faculties, in the variety of forms comprised under the common title of Lyric poetry. We have witnessed, in fine, in these successive phases of national talent, the workings of the wayward infancy and lively youth of the Hellenic mind. In the period before us we shall contemplate its mature manhood; and the first symptoms of that decay which, in the inevitable course of human vicissitude, it was destined to undergo.

All literature ranges itself under the two general heads or departments of Poetry and Prose. Each of these departments comprises various orders or styles of composition, standing in a certain relation or analogy to parallel orders in the other department.

Poetry comprises the Epic, Lyric, Didactic, and Dramatic orders of composition.

In Prose literature, History stands in the relation above noticed to Epic poetry; Oratory to Lyric poetry; the Dialogue to the Drama. The title Didactic, or Instructive, is common, in each department, to the branches of literature the nature and object of which it more immediately denotes.

Of these orders or styles, three — Epic poetry, Lyric poetry, and Didactic poetry — have been treated in previous portions of this work. The subject of Epic poetry may indeed be said to have there been exhausted, in regard to all the higher objects of inquiry which it presents. Original genius in that branch of composition was limited in Greece to the Poetical age; and, during that age, all the epic works possessing claims to genuine inspiration were produced. Those to which attention will hereafter be directed are marked, either by servile imitation of the old Homeric manner, or, where aiming at originality, by laboured effort and pedantic artifice. This extinction of Epic genius must, however, on grounds elsewhere fully stated, be considered not so much the fault of the poets as of the age in which they lived. Even a second Homer, appearing in the age of Sophocles, could not have produced a second Iliad; while, had Sophocles been contemporaneous with Homer, he might have proved no mean rival of his great epic master.

With the Lyric Muse the case was different. The causes which obtained for her a place in the order of cultivation second to that occupied by her Epic sister have also, in the previous volumes, been carefully considered.[1] That patriarchal simplicity of heroic life, and that identity between the imaginative impulses of the individual and those of the entire nation, which were essential to the perfection of the one style of composition, were proportionally less favourable to the other. The higher efforts of lyric art depended for their success on the more complicated social relations, which tend to concentrate the sympathies around local and real, rather than national and ideal objects. The same causes, however, which retarded the advance of lyric poetry, secured it, when brought to maturity, a more enduring prosperity and a more varied sphere of influence. As the poetry of civilised life, it continued to be cultivated with success, in some one or other of its branches, during the whole flourishing age of Greek literature; and even in the lower stages of national debasement, the comparatively feeble or laboured efforts of the superannuated Lyric Muse, were at times lighted up by a spirit savouring of better days, but of which little or no trace is perceptible in the epic poetry of the same period.

The other order of Poetical composition above classed under the head of Didactic, as having been also cultivated during the Poetical period, was as yet too much in its infancy, or had assumed too little of a distinctive character, to entitle it to treatment as a separate branch of subject in the history of that period. Its leading productions were, both in form

[1] Vol. I. p. 171. sqq.; II. p. 2. sqq.

and style, so nearly related either to the purely epic or purely lyric order of composition, that it appeared the more convenient course to treat them as themselves varieties of one or other of those orders. Such are the Works and Days, and the Theogony, of "Hesiod;" such the metrical Commentaries of Solon and other poets of the Gnomic school. During the Attic period, Didactic poetry, while assuming a more distinct independence of character, can advance comparatively little claim to general influence or popularity; prose being now commonly preferred in treating the class of subjects to which the title Didactic properly belongs.

The remaining orders of composition above specified — the Drama, and Prose writing, under its several varieties of history, oratory, didactic prose, and the more elementary styles of miscellaneous literature — first rose to the rank of cultivated branches of pursuit during this period. Within its limits they attained their highest excellence, and it also witnessed the early stages of their decline. Prose composition consequently, and the Drama, possess a prior claim on attention in this portion of our subject. Before, however, entering in detail on the origin or history of either, it will be proper to take a concise general view of the characteristics of the entire Attic period of Grecian literature, in itself, and as contrasted with that which preceded.

Distinctive characteristics of the Attic period.

2. The primary source of that excellence which the Greek nation attained in every branch of polite art, was the high perfection in which it possessed the two varieties of mental faculty on which success in every human undertaking depends — the faculty of Imagination, and the faculty of Judgement or Intellect;

the just blending and balancing of which secured to the same favoured people an equally ample endowment of the faculties of Invention and Taste.

The period treated in the previous volumes was that during which the imaginative powers were chiefly in the ascendant; yet still so far restrained or chastened by the rival influence, as to obviate those extravagant ebullitions of excited feeling, or those grotesque aberrations of fancy, which usually characterise the literary efforts of nations in a similar state society.

In the present period we shall find the faculty of Intellect obtaining in its turn an ascendancy both in the character and the literature of the Greeks: an ascendancy, however, far from despotic, but modified by the lately dominant influence in a degree sufficient to insure a genial warmth and vitality even to the more studied productions of the now comparatively reflective and philosophical Hellenic muse.

The Athenians deficient in the imaginative faculty.

These observations will enable us the better to appreciate one of the most interesting features in the history of Hellenic literature — the harmony between the character of this its most important era, and the character of the people by whom, or under whose auspices, during that era, its most important works were produced. While the Athenians are preeminently entitled to rank as the representatives of the intellectual element of the Grecian character, they are, as compared with their Ionian and Æolian kinsmen, proportionally wanting in its imaginative element. Abundant evidence of this deficiency is supplied by the annals of the foregoing Poetical period, the genius of which offered the greatest scope to the play of the fancy in literary composition. Through-

out that entire period, comprising, between the probable age of Homer and the year 560 B.C., some four or five centuries, and presenting in every other part of Hellas brilliant displays of imaginative genius, Attica cannot boast of a single genuine development of native poetical talent. The only cases where an exception might possibly be urged are those of Solon and Tyrtæus. But Solon, while belonging as much or more to the present than to the past age, or forming, at least, a transition from the one to the other, was himself a poet by art and intellect rather than by nature; and, had he lived in the time of Pericles, would probably have been a prose author. The Attic nativity of Tyrtæus remains, at the best, somewhat doubtful. But even granting it to be ascertained, when we remember that his muse was dumb so long as he remained in his native Attica; that his migration to the supposed less genial soil of Sparta was the immediate cause of his poetical activity; that his inspirations were elicited solely by Spartan objects and interests; and that no trace of Attic associations can be detected in his verse, it must be admitted that the exception, in his case, acquires all the weight which usually attaches to an example in confirmation of the rule.

Altered positions of Sparta and Athens in regard to polite culture.

Another phenomenon in the history of Greek polite culture, which here forces itself on the attention, is the difference between the relative positions which Sparta and Athens occupied in regard to elegant literature in the Poetical period, and those which they respectively hold in that on which we are now entering. During a considerable portion of the former period[1] Sparta was nearly as much the metropolitan centre of

[1] Vol. III. p. 46. sqq.

literary pursuit, and the chosen home of men of genius, as Athens was in the age of Pericles. Although, from causes already examined, she was never in any age herself prolific in authors; she had yet in those early days her Cinæthon in the epic department of poetry, and her Gitiadas and Xenodamus among the musicians of recorded fame; while it was in the capacity of Spartan guests or citizens that most of the celebrated Æolian, Ionian, and Dorian masters,—Terpander, Thaletas, Sacadas, Alcman, Polymnestus,— composed and taught. That Sparta was also familiar from the eighth century downwards with the Homeric poems is evinced, as well by the tradition of their importation into Greece by Lycurgus, as by the fact of Terpander, the state-musician of Sparta, having adapted portions of them to his musical compositions. Athens on the other hand, during the same Poetical period, produced neither epic poet nor musician; and far from being able to boast either a Terpander or an Alcman among her adopted citizens, the single lyric artist whom she claims is only known to have been an Athenian from the circumstance of his having preferred Sparta as the field for the exercise of his talents. Even the poems of Homer were, if we may trust her own tradition, unknown or little cared for in Athens until the time of Solon and Pisistratus. Before the days of those two enlightened citizens, Attica was, in fact, in all that concerns literature, a still more barren waste than Lacedæmon became in her turn during the period now before us, in which Athens appears as the hotbed of Hellenic talent, and the centre of every species of intellectual pursuit both to her own citizens and to the foreigners who flocked to her schools.

Causes of the change.

3. This remarkable interchange of habits and tastes,

between the two leading states of Greece, is one of those phenomena which the more careless student of history is apt to overlook altogether; which often cause serious embarrassment to the critical inquirer; and which as often lead the more subtle speculator into fallacious theories, in his attempts to trace them to their origin. The best and simplest explanation of the problem which here presents itself, in so far at least as Athens is concerned, has already been given in the remark above made, as to the ascendant of the Intellectual over the Imaginative faculty in that particular modification of the Greek mind which fell to the lot of the Athenians. This peculiarity naturally rendered the full development of their equally peculiar order of talent for literature dependent on a corresponding advancement of their social condition. The circumstances are here parallel to those formerly noticed as having tended during the Poetical period, first to retard, and then to stimulate, the cultivation of lyric art. As in the Hellenic nation at large a certain advance of civilisation was required to bring that more intellectual order of poetry to maturity; so the peculiar genius of the Attic Hellene required a still further advance of social life to bring his peculiar order of literary talents into activity. Those talents accordingly, though enlivened in the vigour of their cultivation by a share of the brilliant fancy common to the rest of the Greek race, will yet be found, as compared with those of rival tribes, to be far more dependent, for their full development and successful exercise, on the resources of the intellect than on those of the imagination.

The Athenians deficient in

Hence may be explained, not only why Attica was barren of men of genius during the Poetical age, but

Inventive genius,

the no less striking fact, that, while admitted to have carried to perfection all the higher branches of composition which flourished during the present more enlightened period, the drama, history, oratory, and didactic prose, she did not initiate a single one of them. Original invention in elegant pursuit is the special province of the Imagination; to mature and perfect the inventions of others is that of the Intellect. Prose composition in all its departments had reached an advanced stage of maturity before Athens produced a prose writer. Oratory was first raised to the rank of a written order of composition by Sicilians. Didactic prose, comprising grammar and criticism, also took its rise in the colonial states of Greece; to whom the Athenians owed their first instruction in those departments. If there be any branch of literature in which Athens might seem to possess a legitimate claim to priority, it is the drama. Yet even here her title is defective. The germ of all scenic entertainment is confessedly traceable to the Dorians. And even admitting the merit, which cannot be denied to Athens, of having formed the classical drama out of the rude elements supplied by the dithyramb of Arion, or the comedy of Susarion, to be equivalent to invention, this single exception would tend in some sense to confirm the rule. The Attic drama is of all orders of poetical composition the most artificial; being, in fact, an ingenious compound of the same epic and lyric elements which had already, in their separate form, reached their highest excellence in the works of Homer, Archilochus, and Stesichorus: it is consequently, of all, the one least dependent on the spontaneous working of the imagination, and the most dependent on the exercise of the intellect. It may be further remarked, as

another practical proof of the justice of this estimate of Attic genius, that of all the tribes of Greece the Athenians were the least distinguished by talent for the art of music. Nor is this deficiency limited to their early days. It is observable throughout the whole period of their ascendancy in elegant pursuit. While the Æolians muster, in every age, by far the most numerous array of masters of first rank, Terpanden, Arion, Sappho, Stesichorus, Xenocritus; the Dorians had also their Thaletas, Sacadas, Crates, and Lasus; the Ionians their Archilochus, Polymnastus, and Timotheus. But not a single native Athenian musician of high celebrity is upon record, scarcely the name of an Athenian musician of any rank at any period. This remark may be extended from the art of music, to the branch of poetry which chiefly depends on musical accompaniment. Athens cannot boast at any epoch of her history a single melic poet of high distinction. It is true that much fine melic composition is embodied in the Attic drama, and in so far the great masters of the Athenian stage may rank as melic poets. But here again they must rank as poets of the artistic rather than the original order. The dithyrambic branch of lyric composition, the only branch ever popular at Athens, was also the most artificial; and not one even of the more distinguished dithyrambic poets was a native of Attica. This defect of Attic genius also shows itself in the lateness of the epoch at which the Athenian musical festivals, in the proper sense, were established, and in the small celebrity which they enjoyed as compared with those of Sparta. The Spartan Carnea and Gymnopædia, are the most antient institutions of the kind on record; and those which exercised the most bene-

And in musical talent.

ficial influence on the art of Grecian music. No notice occurs of any similar institution at Athens before the time of Solon[1]; and such as afterwards existed are acknowledged, by the Attic critics themselves, to have done more to corrupt, than improve, the musical taste of the nation.[2]

Decline of polite culture in Sparta.

The decline among the Spartans of that taste for polite literature which distinguished their early days, finds its explanation in the political institutions of the state rather than in the character of the citizens; unless, indeed, in so far as the institutions of every country must be considered as reflecting in some degree the character of the people. Although the letter of the Spartan legislation can hardly have been less rigorously enforced in the age of Lycurgus, or in that of the rulers who rank as his immediate successors, than in later times, there is yet reason to believe that the ascetic spirit of that legislation was extended with the extension of the power of the republic. In the primitive ages of her constitution, the rude discipline which it enjoined could have constituted but a slender mark of distinction between her manners and those of the kindred states of Peloponnesus. The laws of Lycurgus did little more probably than reduce to method and permanence, stereotype as it were, those primitive usages which were once more or less common to the other subdivisions of the Dorian race. While the neighbouring states, unfettered by the restrictions to which Lacedæmon had subjected herself, continued to advance, simultaneously with the rest of Greece, in social refinement, the Spartans remained stationary.

[1] The first establishment of a lyric solemnity, in the proper sense, at Athens, is ascribed by Plutarch to Pericles, in Vit. XIII.

[2] See Vol. III. p. 91.

And as this stationary condition of manners coincided with a still increasing ascendancy of Sparta in political affairs, it was natural for the republic to connect these two circumstances, the backwardness of her social habits, and the advance of her political power, in the ratio of cause and effect; and to plume herself more and more on her rude simplicity of life, as both the source and the evidence of her superiority to her neighbours. The result could hardly fail to be a progressively increasing disregard of those more genial pursuits on which she formerly prided herself; and a more exclusive devotion to those martial and political objects by which the faculties of her citizens seem to be absorbed during the period of Grecian history now before us. The inducements which, under these altered circumstances, the other states of Greece offered to the cultivation of native genius, or to the settlement of enlightened foreigners in their capitals, now naturally became as much superior, as they had formerly been inferior, to those held out by Lacedæmon.

Political vicissitudes of Greece during the Attic period.

4. Such appear to be the broader features of distinction between the Attic period of Grecian literature, and the Poetical period which it succeeded. It will be desirable, before entering on the detailed treatment of the varied heads of subject comprised in the history of the former, that we should take a concise general survey of the chief vicissitudes of its intellectual culture, in connexion with a parallel view of those vicissitudes of civil history on which the destinies of literature must always greatly depend.

The period to which, according to the plan laid down in the opening chapter of this work, the title Attic has been given, extends from the year 560 B.C.,

to the death of Alexander in 323 B.C.[1] The more momentous political events which it comprises are subjoined in chronological order:

B.C.

560. Usurpation of the supreme power at Athens by Pisistratus.
546. The Lydian monarchy overthrown by Cyrus, and the Greek colonies of Asia subjected to the Persian Empire.
527. Death of Pisistratus.
522. Death of Polycrates of Samos.
514. Hipparchus slain by Harmodius and Aristogiton.
510. Expulsion of Hippias from Athens, and end of the Attic "Tyranny."
499. The Athenians aid the Ionian colonies in their revolt against Darius, and burn Sardis.
494. Miletus taken and destroyed by the Persians.
490. Invasion of Attica by Datis and Artaphernes. Battle of Marathon.
480. Invasion of Greece by Xerxes. Battles of Thermopylæ and Salamis.
479. Battles of Platæa and Mycale.
477. Political ascendancy of Athens under the administration of Cimon and Aristides. The colonies of Asia Minor and the islands become her tributaries. Climax of Athenian power and prosperity during the ensuing half century.
470. Pericles begins to direct the affairs of Athens.
445. Thirty years' alliance between Athens and Sparta, and their respective confederates.
444. Supremacy of the democratic party, headed by Pericles, at Athens. Foundation of Thurium.
435. War between Corcyra and Corinth.
431. Rupture of the Thirty years' alliance, and outbreak of the Peloponnesian war.
430. Plague at Athens.
429. Death of Pericles.
425. Capture of Sphacteria and its Spartan garrison by Demosthenes and Cleon.
424. Taking of Amphipolis by the Spartans. Disgrace and exile of Thucydides the historian.
422. Deaths of Cleon and Brasidas in the battle of Amphipolis.

[1] This epoch has been considered preferable to that of the foundation of Alexandria adopted in Chap. i. p. 6.

B.C.

415. Athenian expedition against Sicily. Mutilation of the Attic Hermæ. Alcibiades quits the Athenian fleet at Catana, and takes refuge in Sparta.
413. Destruction of the Athenian armament in Sicily.
412. Theatre of war transferred to the coast of Asia.
411. Ascendancy of the aristocratic party in Athens. Appointment of Alcibiades to the command of the Athenian forces.
407. Alcibiades again superseded and exiled.
406. Battle of Arginusæ.
405. Battle of Ægospotami.
404. Surrender of Athens to Lysander. Close of the Peloponnesian war.
401. Expedition and death of Cyrus. Retreat of the Ten thousand.
395. Defeat and death of Lysander at Haliartus in Bœotia.
394. Victory of Agesilaus at Coronea.
378. Rise of the Theban ascendancy under Pelopidas and Epaminondas.
371. Battle of Leuctra.
362. Battle of Mantinea, and death of Epaminondas.
359. Accession of Philip to the throne of Macedon.
357. Outbreak of the Social war.
352. Philip master of Thessaly.
338. Battle of Chæronea. Philip master of Greece.
336. Death of Philip, and accession of Alexander.
334. March of Alexander against Persia.
332. Foundation of Alexandria.
323. Death of Alexander.

This period may, with more immediate reference to the connexion between the above series of political events and the parallel vicissitudes of literature, be appropriately considered under three subordinate epochs:

I. From the usurpation of Pisistratus to the reestablishment of the Commonwealth by Clisthenes in 510.
II. From the latter event to the conclusion of the

Peloponnesian war, and submission of Athens to Sparta in 404.

III. From the political ascendancy of Sparta, as then established, to the close of the period.

560—510. B.C.

General view of Greek literature from 560 B.C. to 510 B.C.

5. Before the era of Pisistratus, Solon had been author of the first recorded attempt of an Attic statesman, to promote among his fellow-citizens a taste for elegant literature. By him were established the periodical recitals of the Homeric poems, in the public festivals, by professional rhapsodists. Pisistratus, following up and improving this institution, undertook, with the aid of several men of letters resident at his court, a compilation and arrangement of those poems in the order of their epic sequel. This compilation appears to have comprised, besides the Iliad and Odyssey, which alone in critical quarters possessed undisputed claim to emanate from the genuine Homer, the greater part of the works known in later times by the title of Homeric or Cyclic poems. Allusion also occurs to a similar compilation by Pisistratus, of the poems of Hesiod[1]; and a like service appears to have been rendered by him or his literary coadjutors to the works attributed to the legendary bards, Musæus, Orpheus, Pamphos, and others. These improved editions of the national poems were prepared, it may be supposed, for the "public library" established by the usurper in his native city.[2] It seems however doubtful, whether the phrase Public library can here properly be taken in the sense which attaches to it in modern times, as denoting a miscellaneous collection

Pisistratus.

[1] For these details see Vol. I. p. 188. 204. sqq., 213. 518.; conf. Hereas in Plutarch, Vit. Thes. xx.

[2] Athen. I. p. 3.; Aul. Gell. VI. 17.

of books accessible for perusal or consultation to the citizens at large; in which sense it appears to be applied by ancient authors to the institution of Pisistratus. His library was probably little more than a repository of what formed in those days the state literature of the Greek republics. Such were the oracular or Sibylline books, which in the early days of Athens and Sparta, as of Rome, constituted an important engine of state policy; and to which class belonged the hymns of "Musæus" and "Pamphos" above noticed. Such were also the state editions of "Homer," "Hesiod," and other popular poets, recited in the public solemnities.

Cleomenes, king of Sparta, on his occupation of Athens in 509 B.C., is stated by Herodotus[1] to have carried off the sacred part of this collection. The remainder is described, on less valid authority, as having been transported by Xerxes to Susa; and as having afterwards, when that metropolis fell into the hands of the Macedonians, been restored by Seleucus Nicator to the Athenians.[2] This story is certainly far from probable. That a Persian emperor, when bent on the destruction of the most sacred monuments of the conquered city, should have attached so great a value to a few manuscripts of Greek poets and soothsayers, is difficult to believe. Nor is it likely that a collection of such celebrity as to possess interest even in the eyes of a barbarous invader, would have been forgotten by the Athenians themselves in abandoning the city, when at pains to remove other state valuables of a portable description. But whatever may have been its fate, there is no authentic trace of its existence after the Persian war.

[1] v. 90.

[2] A. Gell. loc. cit.

His literary circle.

As coadjutors of Pisistratus in his literary undertakings are mentioned Onomacritus of Athens, Orpheus of Croto, and Zopyrus of Heraclea. Onomacritus, besides his share in the Homeric labours of his patron, was specially intrusted with the compilation of "Musæus;" and in the course of this performance, he is said to have been detected by the lyric poet Lasus, in the act of interpolating spurious verses of his own, on the no less spurious works which bore the name of the Thracian bard.[1] Some authors give him credit for most of the poems that passed current under the title Musæus in later times, and for several of those popularly ascribed to the Thracian Orpheus. Orpheus of Croto and Zopyrus also possess claims to original authorship in the same branch of poetry cultivated by their colleague Onomacritus. All these personages[2] appear to have belonged to that mystically religious school of authors whose works passed current under the common title of Orphic, and were nearly connected, in doctrine and style, with the productions of the Pythagorean and other mystical schools of philosophy, which flourished about this time.

To Pisistratus is assigned[3] the institution of the greater Panathenaïca, with which festival the recitals of Homer, and some other literary entertainments of a popular nature, were chiefly connected. It was also under his government, and it may be presumed under his auspices, that in the year 535 B.C. the first attempts were made by Thespis to mature the dithyrambic mimes of the local Dionysiaca into the Athenian

[1] Herodot. VII. 6.

[2] Vol. I. p. 205.; conf. Clem. Alex. Str. I. p. 332. sq.; Pausan. I. xxii. 7., VIII. xxxi., I. xxxvii. 3., IX. xxxv. 1.; Suid. v. Orpheus; Lobeck, Aglaoph. p. 311. 353. sqq. 386.

[3] Schol. Aristid. p. 323. ed. Dind. vol. III.

tragedy. Of the Attic comedy, although it had probably assumed, before the time of Thespis, a certain regularity of dramatic arrangement, we hear little or nothing until a later period.

The influence of this enlightened usurper was as zealously exercised in the arts of design as in literature. He was the founder of various fine public buildings[1]; and one, the temple of Jupiter Olympius, was conceived by him on such a scale of grandeur, as to place the execution of his plan beyond the resources of Athens or of Greece during her flourishing ages. The fine pleasure-grounds and porticoes afterwards known by the title of Lyceum, as a favourite resort of the citizens for gymnastic and literary recreation, were originally his private gardens, thrown open for the benefit of his fellow-countrymen.[2] Pisistratus was further honourably distinguished among the tyrants of this and the last generation by the humanity of his government. No act of wanton cruelty or oppression has been imputed to him. The value even of this negative testimony to his amiable qualities is the greater, from its contrast to the marked tendency of the popular Greek historians to blacken the characters of the petty despots, so many of whom sprang up about this time in different parts of the confederacy. The merits of Pisistratus, as a man, are eulogised even by those who least admired his conduct as a citizen.[3]

Hippias and Hipparchus, his sons and inheritors of his power, also inherited, the latter more especially, his taste for elegant pursuit, and share with him, The Pisistratidæ.

[1] Smith, Biogr. Dict. vol. III. p. 171. sq.

[2] Theopomp. ap. Athen. XII. p. 533., conf. ap. Suid. et Harpocr. v. Λύκειον; Schol. ad Lucian. Pisc. 52.

[3] Plut. Sol. 29. Herodot. I. 59.

under the family title of Pisistratidæ, the credit of his principal undertakings. Their court remained a favourite resort of foreign men of letters. The more celebrated of these were the lyric poets, Anacreon, Simonides, and Lasus the preceptor of Pindar.[1] Hipparchus, if not the first author of the popular Attic custom of erecting Hermæ or columnar way-posts in the thoroughfares of the Attic Demi, was the first who decorated those monuments with appropriate inscriptions for the entertainment and instruction of the passers by.[2] Contemporaneous with the Pisistratidæ, and celebrated like the chief of the family for the institution of a public library, was another enlightened tyrant, Polycrates of Samos. His court, like that of Athens, was a favourite resort of men of genius; among others of Anacreon, who acted as preceptor to his son.[3]

Polycrates of Samos.

Backward state of Attic literature under the Pisistratidæ.

But however great the merit of these princes as promoters of literature within the limited field of exertion which royal patronage could provide, there can be little doubt that in some essential respects their influence tended to obstruct rather than advance the objects which they had at heart. Those spontaneous developments of talent to which nations are indebted for great original works, are in all ages more or less inseparable from a warm sentiment of patriotism concentrated around a popular form of government. The term Popular government must not, in this general application of it, be strictly understood in the sense of Free constitution now habitually

[1] Herodot. vii. 6.; Pseudo-Plat. in Hipparch. p. 228 Ælian. V. H. viii. 2.

[2] Pseudo-Plat. loc. cit.

[3] Herodot. iii. 121.; Strab. xiv. p. 638.

attached to it; for the patriotic feelings of many nations have been centred, with the attachment which leads to such results, on forms of government far from popular in the constitutional sense. In the case of the Greeks, however, the phrase may truly admit of the more limited signification; for in no instance do the national sympathies of any Hellenic state, in historical times, appear to have been permanently enlisted in favour of any government which can be called monarchal in the modern sense. The sway of a single ruler, however mild and generous, was so repugnant to the feelings of Greek freemen, that whenever they felt conscious of the power, they seldom wanted the will, to exchange even the most prosperous state of "tyranny" for the turmoil of republican faction with all its attendant evils. This tone of feeling necessarily placed the Greek sovereign, whatever his own inclinations, under the necessity of governing with a strong hand and a jealous policy, such as could not fail to cramp the intellectual energies of his subjects; and the Pisistratidæ here formed no exception to the general rule. To whatever extent they may, by their wealth and taste, have contributed to nurse the infancy of their native literature, its vigorous youth and manhood required to be trained under a more free and independent form of education. Accordingly, amidst all their efforts to supply materials for mental improvement from abroad, there is little trace of any attempt on the part of their subjects to turn to account the rich resources of their own genius. During the fifty years of the Tyranny no literary work worth preservation was produced by a native Athenian. The first appearance of Phrynichus, the earliest Attic tragedian in the classical sense, dates about the time

of the expulsion of Hippias; and the first dramatic work entitled to rank as truly great or national, the Sack of Miletus by that poet, was brought out twelve years later. It is plain that this tragedy could not have been acted, still less could the enthusiasm with which it was received have found vent, under the previous monarchal rule; its power over the sympathies of the audience being inseparable from the indignation excited against the Persian monarch, with whom the Pisistratidæ were connected by ties both of personal friendship and political interest.

Poetry and prose flourish in the Ionian colonies.

Among the other Greek states, the Ionian colonies continue during the Pisistratian era to maintain their former superiority to Athens, both in the excellence of their works, and in priority of invention. Prose composition, in its historical department, was steadily advancing towards maturity by the efforts chiefly of Milesian writers, Cadmus, Hecatæus, Dionysius; to which names may be added that of Acusilaus an Argive by birth, but an Ionian in dialect and style. In didactic prose similar progress was making under the auspices of Pherecydes of Syros, Anaximander of Miletus, and Pythagoras of Samos, all Ionians, the latter however domiciled in Magna Græcia. Of the two older — epic and lyric — branches of poetical composition, the latter continued to flourish with much of its former lustre. The list of distinguished lyric poets whose active lives fall in whole or in part within this half-century comprises, in the properly melic department, the names Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides, and Lasus; with that of Hipponax the iambographer, and those of the elegiac or gnomic poets, Xenophanes, Theognis, and Phocylides. Of these all were Ionians except Ibycus of Rhegium, Lasus of

Hermione, and Theognis of Megara, natives of Dorian states. The name of no epic poet of this epoch has been recorded.

### 510—404 B. C.

General view of Greek literature from 510 B.C. to 404 B.C.

6. The restoration of Attic freedom by Clisthenes in 510 B.C. imparted the first real vitality to native Attic literature. There are few more interesting phenomena in the history of our species, than the harmony between the career of Athens in political power, and the career of Attic genius in literature and art, in the century subsequent to the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ. During the thirty years between that event and the close of the Persian war in 479 B.C. the tragic drama was matured by Phrynichus, Chœrilus, Pratinas, and Æschylus, into those elementary forms of dignity and beauty which it continued to expand and embellish throughout the ensuing Periclean age. The remainder of the century witnessed, besides the more finished productions of the tragedians above named, the whole career of the succeeding authors of highest eminence; of Sophocles, Euripides, Ion, and others who competed with them, often successfully, for the prize. The early history of the Comic drama evinces still more clearly the vital connexion between the political and literary energies of the Athenians. It is certain that in the hands of the Dorian Susarion, about the close of the Poetical period (564 B.C.), comedy had already assumed a regularity of scenic arrangement greater than tragedy could boast in the time of Thespis thirty years afterwards. Yet during the eighty years that elapsed between Susarion and the Persian

Poetry.

war, in the last fifty of which tragedy had been steadily advancing to perfection, we hear nothing of the sister dramatic muse. The meagre notices of the "revival," as it has been called, of Susarion's comedy, shortly before the Persian invasion (480 B.C.), by the obscure poets, Euctes, Euxenides, and Myllus, imply that the art had lain dormant during the intermediate time. The cause of its rapid progress and popularity in the next generation, connects itself obviously with the simultaneous ascendancy of the democratic principle in the Attic commonwealth, and with the uncontrolled freedom afforded to the peculiar class of satire which constituted the soul of the genuine Attic comedy. Accordingly, the most brilliant age of the Athenian democracy, extending over the middle and latter portion of this century, is also the most brilliant age of comedy as carried to perfection by its three greatest masters, Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes, and by their little less illustrious competitors, Crates, Pherecrates, Amipsias, and Plato.

Tragedy remained, during the entire Attic period, the exclusive privilege and glory of Athens. The only other part of Hellas where comedy became a cultivated order of literature was Sicily; chiefly under the auspices of Epicharmus, a Dorian of Cos, settled, first when an infant at the Hyblæan Megara, afterwards in the neighbouring metropolis of Syracuse. He flourished about the time of the obscure authors above mentioned as the revivers of Susarion's comedy at Athens.[1] This coincidence, with

[1] A more ancient Sicilian comedian, quoted by Epicharmus himself, was Aristoxenus of Selinus, who seems to have stood to Epicharmus somewhat in the same relation as Thespis to Phrynichus. Hephæst. Gaisf. p. 45.

the priority of Sicily in other new branches of composition which began about the same time to be cultivated in Athens under Sicilian masters, certainly favours the opinion countenanced also by Aristotle[1], that the successful efforts of Epicharmus to improve the Comic drama of Sicily, had stimulated the advance of that of Athens.

Another inferior order of Sicilian comedy, called the Mime, was raised during this century to the rank of a cultivated order of literature by Sophron, its imputed inventor.[2] These entertainments, said to have been much relished by Plato[3], and to have been first introduced by him at Athens, seem to have been but an improvement on the old Doric mimes, or rude dithyrambs of the Dicelistæ and Autocabdali, described in a previous volume.

Athens produced no poet of celebrity, during this century, in any branch of composition but the drama. The little success of the attempts made by Panyasis of Halicarnassus, Chœrilus of Samos, and Antimachus of Colophon, to reap laurels on the exhausted field of epic poetry, abundantly justify the backwardness of the Athenian men of letters to waste their time in similar efforts.

Lyric poetry continued to flourish in other parts of Greece. The most celebrated names of this epoch are those of the Bœotian Pindar and Corinna, of the Ionian Simonides and Bacchylides, and of the Dorian Timocreon. The deficiency of the Athenians in talent or taste for pure lyric poetry, or the entire absorption of such as they possessed by the lyric

[1] Poet. 3. [2] Aristot. Poet. 1.

[3] Quintil. I. x. 17.; Diogen. La. III. 18.; Suid. v. Sophr.; Tzetz. Chil. x. 1006.

element of their drama, is further evinced by the fact that scarcely one of the more esteemed masters, even of that meretricious order of lyric performance which from its popularity at Athens was called the Attic dithyramb, was a native Athenian. The more celebrated composers in this department were, Lasus of Hermione, its supposed originator under the Pisistratidæ, but who continued to flourish after their expulsion, Melanippides of Melos, Phrynis of Mitylene, and Timotheus of Miletus. Lamprocles alone, a poet apparently of some merit, is claimed by the Athenians as their fellow-citizen. Another of inferior rank, Cinesias, is disputed between Athens and Thebes.

Prose literature.

In the more intellectual branches of literature, History, Rhetoric, and the several orders of Didactic composition, Athens still lags behind her colonial neighbours. She cannot as yet claim a prose historian as her own citizen. The younger Pherecydes, though commonly styled of Athens, from having fixed his abode there, is understood to have been a native of the Ionian isle of Leros. Of the other leading contemporaneous writers of the same class, Charon was an Ionian of Lampsacus, Xanthus a Lydian, Hellanicus an Æolian of Lesbos, and Herodotus a Dorian of Halicarnassus. To a colonial author, Glaucus of Rhegium, Greece was also indebted for her first recorded essay in Literary history.

In the literature of philosophy, the other Greek states, especially the Sicilian and Italian colonies, still maintain their preeminence, without as yet a successful attempt at rivalry on the part of Athens. Nor indeed before the middle of the fifth century do the moral or speculative sciences appear to have been

habitually taught in that city as a separate branch of pursuit. In so far as cultivated at all, they are familiarly alluded to as forming but a part of the same course of polite education which in those days was chiefly in the hands of the music masters and professional rhapsodists.[1] The great names in the philosophical literature of this epoch are, Heraclitus of Ephesus, Parmenides and Zeno of Elea, Empedocles of Agrigentum, Anaxagoras of Clazomene, Diagoras of Melos, and Democritus of Abdera.[2] The credit of Athens, even as a promoter of foreign talent, is here not unsullied. The same Democracy which enjoyed the licentious satires of the comedian against the absurdities of the popular superstition, denied all free expression of opinion to the sage who proposed, even in the most respectful forms of argument, to substitute for those absurdities sounder views of the truths of natural religion. Of the three more distinguished teachers, Anaxagoras, Diagoras, and Zeno, who, under the patronage of Pericles or other enlightened citizens, settled at Athens, the first two were banished by the Democracy for presuming to teach anything worth learning on those higher subjects; and Anaxagoras, in his absence, was condemned to death by the same illiberal tribunal. Their subsequent treatment of Socrates, whose career of public instruction also falls for the most part within this epoch, but who takes no literary rank in the proper sense, not having committed his lectures to writing, forms an appropriate

[1] Plat. Lach. p. 180.; Plut. vit. Pericl. 4.

[2] Archelaus, the reputed master of Socrates, is of doubtful nativity. By some he is called a Milesian; by others he is claimed, not without plausibility, as a native Athenian; even in his Attic capacity he is principally distinguished for having first introduced the physical philosophy from Ionia into the city.

sequel to that which the enlightened strangers who preceded him had experienced at their hands. This spirit of intolerance, in matters of speculative doctrine or opinion, is the greatest blot in the character of Athens, especially of her democracy, under which it solely or chiefly displays itself. It appears also in the more offensive light, from its contrast to the liberality by which, in this respect, the rest of the Greek nation was so honourably distinguished.[1]

Even in oratory, the art in which her superiority to all rivals is so well established, Athens must yield the palm of originality to Sicily. The honour of having first constituted eloquence a branch of literature is due to that island. The oratory of nature must, it is true, have attained in the time of Pericles at least as high a stage of excellence at Athens as elsewhere. It is however not with the oratory of nature, of which Homer was as great a master as Demosthenes, but with the literature of oratory, that we have here to deal. The earliest professional teachers in that department were Corax and Tisias both of Syracuse, and Empedocles of Agrigentum; all nearly contemporaneous. Corax and Tisias were authors of the first recorded treatises on rhetorical composition. Gorgias of Leontini, by his improvements on their system, and by the brilliancy of his own style, secured a more extended popularity to the new profession. To these Sicilian masters, especially to Gorgias, all the great professional orators of Athens were indebted, directly or indirectly, for their education. The first Athenian prose writer was the orator Antiphon, a younger contemporary of Gorgias, during the latter half of the fifth century B. C.

[1] See Appendix A.

The lectures of Gorgias, and other contemporaneous teachers of the same class, the more popular of whom were Protagoras of Abdera, Prodicus of Ceos, and Hippias of Elis, embraced also the sciences of grammar, literary criticism, logic, and speculative philosophy; and to them, and other foreigners, the Athenians were solely or chiefly indebted for their first more extended proficiency in those several branches of pursuit.

In the literature of science, in the narrower sense of the term, the name of the great physician Hippocrates, a Dorian of Cos, alone takes rank with those of the principal authors in other departments of prose.

Didactic or Gnomic poetry, the poetry of the early philosophers, of Solon and the Seven sages, still continued to be preferred to prose by some of their successors; among whom the more distinguished were Parmenides of Elea and Empedocles of Agrigentum.

During the latter half of the fifth century B. C., various successful efforts were made, still by colonial writers, in the livelier orders of miscellaneous prose literature, Biographical memoirs, Notes of travel, and familiar descriptions of men and manners. Among the authors of this class whose works obtained permanent popularity, the two most distinguished were, the Homeric rhapsodist Stesimbrotus of Thasos, and Ion of Chios the tragic poet.

404—323 B. C.

State of literature from 404 B.C. to the close of the Attic pe-

7. During the remaining seventy years, between the close of the Peloponnesian war and that of the entire Attic period, the poetical genius of Athens, which in the previous century had reached its highest stage of

riod — 323 B.C. excellence simultaneously with the climax of her political prosperity, appears subdued and paralysed by the disasters with which that century had terminated. Under the pressure of those disasters, the tragic drama, the chief or only solid basis of Attic renown in the nobler branches of poetry, sank and expired. Sophocles and Euripides, by a striking and affecting coincidence, died the year before the fatal battle of Ægospotamoi, which subjected their native city to the Spartan yoke; and they left no successor whose works acquired permanent popularity or celebrity.

Comedy however continued to flourish. Even national calamity furnished materials for brilliant sarcasm to the Athenian Comic muse. But the humiliation of the Democracy, with whose fortunes her own had from the first been associated, involved a corresponding degradation of her character. Her satire now began to be directed against objects of an inferior order, and to be wielded by less vigorous hands. Aristophanes, it is true, with his rival Plato, survived the fall of the city; but his greatest works, with scarcely an exception, were produced prior to that catastrophe. Still however, inferior as the muse of the Middle comedy, for so this second stage of the art was called, may have proved to her predecessor, in genuine Attic humour, the falling off involved no diminution in the number or enthusiasm of her votaries. The Athenian citizen seems rather to have sought consolation for his misfortunes in a still more exuberant indulgence in such sources of jovial excitement as were still at his command.

Another order of poetical entertainment, which, under these circumstances, could hardly fail to extend its previous popularity, was the Attic dithyramb.

Accordingly these performances, though stigmatised by professional critics of every age as a corruption of the antient pure style of lyro-dramatic poetry, involving a parallel corruption of the sister art of music, assumed from day to day, with a greater complication of artistic forms and a greater display of meretricious graces, a stronger hold on the Athenian public. Nor was this deterioration of taste confined to Athens. The old classic orders of Greek lyric poetry seem to have become virtually extinct about this time throughout Greece, and their place to have been usurped by this same Attic dithyramb under its several varieties. Athens, however, now as formerly, can claim as her own citizens but few of the leading professors in this department. The most celebrated are, Timotheus of Miletus, Philoxenus of Cithera, Telestes of Selinus, and Polyidus of Athens.

This epoch produced no epic poet with any pretensions either to merit or popularity.

The decline of poetical literature was nobly compensated by the rapid development of genius in the more intellectual branches of pursuit. The same national misfortunes which quenched the inspirations of the tragic dramatist seem, by sobering and chastening the Attic mind, to have given a sudden vitality to its hitherto dormant talents for History, Oratory, Philosophy, and miscellaneous literature. The high perfection to which the first three branches of composition were now carried, forms both the alleviation and the glory of the seventy years of political discord and national decay in the Hellenic states, which terminated with the final extinction both of republican liberty and of original genius in art and letters under the Macedonian ascendancy.

In historical composition, Colonial Greece, though no longer able to cope with the standard Athenian authors in that department, continues at least to maintain the respectable position she had held in the days when Athens was still her pupil. The historians of this epoch who rank next to Thucydides and Xenophon, are Philistus of Syracuse, Ctesias of Cnidus, Ephorus of Cuma, and Theopompus of Chios.

In oratory Athens now bears away the palm from every rival. To this epoch belong, in whole or in part, the active lives of eight of the ten Attic orators of the classical canon, inclusive of the four greatest, Demosthenes, Æschines, Lysias, and Isocrates. The two exceptions are, Antiphon, the father of the native Attic school, and Demetrius Phalereus, the last of the ten. No orator of high celebrity flourished in any other state.

In philosophy, Athens, eminent as she now becomes, has still but a share of the great men of the age. Of her three principal authors, Plato, Xenophon, and Speusippus, the former, founder and chief of the Academy, is rivalled by the Stagirite Aristotle, founder of the Peripatetic sect. Xenocrates of Chalcedon, successor of Speusippus in the Academy; Archytas of Tarentum, more celebrated as a lawgiver and statesman than as a philosopher, and the astronomer Eudoxus of Cnidus, educated and settled at Athens, uphold in their several departments the credit of colonial learning.

State of education during the Attic period.

8. Elementary education appears to have been universal among the free citizens of the Greek states during the entire Attic period. Scarcely an allusion

occurs, if indeed an authentic one can be found, to an illiterate Hellene. Even the Spartans, proverbially the least learned people of Greece, were constrained by the spirit, if not by the letter of their state discipline, to acquire at least the art of reading and writing.[1] It is also probable that the slave population of the large towns was in great part similarly qualified, especially in Athens, where much of the practical economy of trade and manufacture, with the details of expenditure and bookkeeping, was in the hands of that class. Schools and schoolmasters, accordingly, are represented as in every part of Greece an essential element of the social system[2]; and the instruction, even of the upper classes, was carried on much more generally in those schools than in the mode of private tuition.[3] The office of the pædagogue, or private tutor, frequently mentioned as superintending the education of young men of rank, was subordinate to the system of public instruction. His duties were, to conduct his pupil to and from the academy, to superintend his moral conduct and manners, and keep him out of danger or mischief. Few of them appear to have been men of a high standard of acquirement, or qualified to assist their pupils effec-

[1] For a full discussion of the whole question of Spartan literary education, see Vol. III. pp. 451. sqq. 501. 504.; and the author's "Remarks" (Longman, 1851) in reply to an elaborate dissertation against his views appended to the third volume (3rd edition) of Mr. Grote's History of Greece.

[2] One of the most curious and apparently authentic notices on the subject is that preserved by Plutarch (Vit. Themist. x.). When the population of Attica abandoned their own country to Xerxes, and took refuge in great part at Trœzen on the coast of Peloponnesus, the Trœzenians, among other munificent hospitalities, decreed, on the motion of a citizen named Nicagoras, that schoolmasters should be provided at state expense for the juvenile portion of their guests.

[3] Plat. Amat. p. 132. A.

tively in their prescribed course of study[1]; and, in Plato's time, those entrusted even with youths of highest rank appear to have been commonly slaves.[2]

The most distinct account of an elementary course of education is given by Plato. "As soon," he informs us, "as a boy has acquired, under the care of his parents, his nursemaid, or his pædagogue, a sense of the distinction between right and wrong, he is sent to school to be instructed in reading, writing, music, and orderly habits. After he has learnt his alphabet, and is practised in reading a continuous text, the schoolmaster selects, as his task, from the works of the best poets, such passages as inculcate the most approved rules of life, and hold up the best examples of virtuous conduct; which lessons he is also made to learn by heart.[3] He is then taught music and the use of the lyre, as the next most effectual source of mental refinement; and his voice is exercised in singing some of the finest odes of the lyric poets, to instil into his mind that sense of harmony so important in after life both to the orator and the man of the world. Upon this should follow a course of athletic exercises in the gymnasium, which finishes the education of the boy, and fits him for the higher training of the citizen."[4] The only part of this higher training here specified by Plato is the study of the law: but, from other sources[5], we

[1] Plat. de Legg. p. 808. D.

[2] Plat. Lys. 208. C., 223. A.; cf. Xenoph. de Rep. Lac. c. 2.

[3] Æsop and Theognis appear to be mentioned by other authorities among the more popular of these elementary class books. Aristoph. Av. 471.; and ap. Plut. ed. Xyland. vol. II. p. 395. D. 777. B.; Lucilius ap. A. Gell. I. 3.

[4] Protag. p. 325., conf. de Legg. p. 809.; Aristot. Polit. VIII. 2. sqq.

[5] Plat. Axioch. p. 366. E., Lysis, passim; Aristoph. Nub. 200. sqq.

learn that in his time the elementary education of the ephebus, or youth of the upper classes, was followed up in the Lyceum, the Academy, or other similar public institutions, by a more enlarged course of instruction, comprised under the heads of rhetoric and philosophy; a course analogous to the university education of our own age. It comprehended mathematics, astronomy, dialectics, oratory, criticism, and the elements of moral science. The masters by whom it was conducted were commonly called sophists, or rhetors, up to about the time of Plato, when the more honourable title of philosophers was generally preferred.

Schools and schoolmasters.

It is remarkable that the frequent notices which occur of schoolmasters and their schools supply so little clear information as to the habits or social position of this important part of the community; nor does it appear whether they were a distinct class, or merely a lower grade of the sophists, or rhetors. They seem, however, to have belonged to the upper rank of citizens in some of the states, and to have been received in the best circles.[1] Such as they were, the lessons they taught were limited to the Greek tongue. Instruction in foreign languages was never esteemed in Greece either a necessary or an important branch of general education. This is a peculiarity which forms also a signal defect of Greek culture as compared with that of modern times. The explanation of its causes, in so far as capable of being explained, has been offered in other parts of this work.

In Athens, and probably in other Greek republics,

[1] Ion Chius, ap. Athen. XIII. p. 604. sq.

every citizen was under at least a moral obligation[1] to provide his sons with a competent knowledge of letters. The discipline of the schools was also under state control.[2] Yet the government no where seems to have provided or maintained them, or to have appointed or paid the schoolmasters, whose livelihood depended on the fees of their pupils.[3] The amount of those fees has not been recorded. But more distinct notices have been transmitted of the charges made by literary professors of the higher class. The fees said to have been paid for a course of instruction to some of the earlier and more distinguished sophists and philosophers are so extravagant as to be scarcely credible, even when attested, as they are in some instances, by the best contemporaneous authority. Protagoras is taunted by Plato[4] as the first professor of the higher branches of learning who taught for hire. If this imputation be well founded, his older contemporaries, Zeno and Gorgias, must have been speedily led by his example to adopt a similar course: for Zeno[5] is said by Plato himself to have been paid 100 minæ, or upwards of 400*l.*, by each disciple, for a course of lectures; and Gorgias[6] also to have been richly remunerated by his pupils. The fees of both Protagoras and Gorgias are rated by other authorities[7] at the same amount as those of Zeno. This sum, taking into account the high value of the precious metals in antient times, would

[1] See Vol. III. p. 448. sqq.
[2] Draco and Solon ap. Æsch. adv. Timarch. p. 32. sqq.
[3] Plato, Eryxias, p. 402. D.
[4] In Protag. p. 349., conf. 329.; Aristot. Eth. Nic. IX. 1. 5.
[5] Alcibiad. I. p. 119. [6] Hipp. Maj. p. 282.
[7] Suid. v. Γοργ; Diod. XII. 53.; Quintil. Inst. Or. III. 1.; Diog. Laert. IX. 52.

be equal to about 2000*l.* of our money. But prices were afterwards greatly reduced[1], as the number of professors increased, and the former blind veneration for their magic powers of communicating knowledge, or for the value of the knowledge communicated, declined. Isocrates, the younger contemporary of Protagoras, and probably the better master of the two, was satisfied with ten minæ, or forty pounds, for a course[2]; which sum seems afterwards to have remained the ordinary rate of payment.[3]

[1] Prodicus is described as being satisfied with payments varying from one to fifty drachmæ, according to the value or difficulty of the science taught. But these may have been the prices of single lectures, not of entire courses. Plat. Axioch. p. 366., Cratyl. p. 384.

[2] Plut. Vit. Demosth. 5., Vit. Dec. Oratt. in Isocrat. p. 143. Tauchn.

[3] Demosth. contr. Lacr. p. 938.; Plat. Apolog. Socr. p. 20.

The virulent terms in which Plato and other Socratics (Plat. Protag. p. 349., Soph. p. 223. sqq., Axioch. p. 366.; Xenoph. Mem. I. ii. 6., I. vi. 13.) inveigh against the practice of teaching for money, as sordid and degrading to the character of a man of science, appear quite senseless, if taken in what certainly seems to be their literal import, as applicable to the acceptance even of a reasonable remuneration for the instruction communicated. A more extravagant utopianism can hardly be imagined, than a rule to preclude men of learning from the right enjoyed by all other men, of gaining their livelihood by their talents and labour. Such a rule would have proved a far more serious obstruction to the advance of learning, than the most excessive spirit of extortion in those proposed to be subjected to it. It would virtually have prevented all but rich men, and by consequence the greater part of those best qualified to teach, from teaching at all: for a man can as little carry on the work of instruction as any other business of life without the means of subsistence. In charity to Plato, therefore, we must assume him to allude rather to the mercenary conduct of some of the popular masters of his own age, in exacting exorbitant fees from wealthy or easy-tempered pupils, than to the acceptance of an equitable, perhaps voluntary, payment for services rendered. The rest may be ascribed to the spirit of malicious exaggeration in which Plato, throughout, handles the character and habits of the "sophists." The contrast, also, between his scornful denunciations of these favourite objects of his sarcasm, and the easy, even complimentary manner in which (Alcib. p. 119.) he mentions the acceptance, by Zeno the philosopher, from rich Athenian pupils, of sums equal to the most extravagant demanded by Gorgias or Protagoras, is very curious.

Libraries.

No distinct notice occurs of the existence, during the Attic period, either at Athens or elsewhere, of a public library, in the familiar sense of a miscellaneous collection of books for the use of the citizens; although, as in the time of Pisistratus, standard editions of the popular works recited in the public solemnities, and more especially of the dramas of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, were preserved at Athens under the charge of the city clerk.[1] Private libraries had, however, already become sufficiently voluminous or curious to merit being specially recorded. Such were those of Euripides[2] the poet, and of Plato[3], part of whose collection was purchased at Tarentum in Italy from the heirs of its former proprietor Philolaus, and another part at Syracuse; those of Euthydemus mentioned by Xenophon[4], of Aristotle, of Nicocrates of Cyprus, and of the Athenian archon Euclides.[5] The varied character of the works stored in the library of a literary professor, towards the close of this period, is illustrated by a scene in a comedy of Alexis, the humour of which turns on the gluttony of Hercules, a hero habitually burlesqued for that failing in the Greek satirical literature. The youthful demigod, when directed by his master, the poet Linus, to select the book he preferred from his preceptor's collection, described as containing the poems of Homer, Orpheus, Hesiod, Chœrilus, Epicharmus, the tragedians, and the popular prose classics, makes choice of a cookery book.[6] That books of all kinds

[1] Plut. Vit. Dec. Oratt. in Lycurg. p. 151. Tauchn.

[2] Athen. I. p. 3.

[3] Diog. La. VIII. 15., III. 13.; Procl. ad Tim. p. 24.; Tzetz. Chil. x. 1004.

[4] Memor. Socr. IV. ii. 1.

[5] Athen. I. p. 3.; Strab. p. 608.

[6] Athen. IV. p. 164.

abounded during the greater part of the Attic period appears, not only from the general familiarity which the educated ranks possessed with the text of the national classics, but still more from the absence of all allusion to a scarcity of copies as interposing any serious obstacle to the attainment of such knowledge. The book trade, however, as a distinct branch of commerce, seems to have been still but limited, as in truth it was comparatively in every age prior to the invention of printing; and remained probably in a great measure in the hands of professional copyists. Booksellers[1], however, and a book mart[2] at Athens, are mentioned by authors flourishing during the Peloponnesian war; and occasional notices occur of book scribes or copyists[3], and of bookbinding.[4] A trade in books or paper was also carried on between Greece and the distant coasts of the Euxine in the time of Xenophon.[5] Yet a considerable time appears to have been required to bring the writings even of the most popular authors into general circulation; and the disciples of distinguished philosophers — Hermodorus, for example, a scholar of Plato — are described as making profit by being the first to transport copies of their masters' lectures into distat localities.[6]

Book trade.

[1] Aristomen. ap. Jul. Poll. VII. xxxiii. 211.
[2] Eupolis, ap. J. Poll. IX. v. 47.
[3] Cratin. et Antiph. ap. J. Poll. VII. 211.
[4] Antiph. ap. J. Poll. ibid.
[5] Anab. VII. v. 14.: conf. Diog. Ln. Vit. Zenon.
[6] Cic. ad Attic. xiii. 21.; Zenob. et Suid. in Ἀγοιτιν' Ερμόδωρος ἐμπορεύεται. This line has been assumed by modern commentators to allude to the sale of books as a thing hitherto rare or unheard of in Sicily, in the time of Plato, or of his disciple Hermodorus. But any such interpretation were incompatible, first, with the state of literature in Greece generally, and more especially in Sicily, at that time; secondly, with the admitted fact that Plato himself had been a purchaser of books in Sicily;

Patrons of literature, Pisistratidæ, Polycrates, Pericles.

9. In drawing this summary to a close, a few remarks are due to the patrons of literature, by whom, in addition to Pisistratus and Polycrates above noticed, this period was adorned. It is remarkable, that while Clisthenes, the restorer of Athenian liberty after the usurpation of the Pisistratidæ, was the most distinguished ancestor of Pericles, the character of Pericles himself bears in many respects a strong resemblance to that of the celebrated founder of the Tyranny subverted by Clisthenes. In their fine taste for literature and art, in their zealous promotion of those pursuits, in their hospitality to foreign men of genius, in the despotic sway which each in his different mode exercised over his fellow-citizens; in the peculiar style, as well as power of their oratory, and, if we may trust the tradition of their countrymen, in their personal appearance[1], the parallel between the enlightened tyrant of the one period, and the enlightened demagogue of the other, is singularly close. Pericles was the most accomplished orator of his day; and is also reported to have been the first Athenian who wrote his speeches before delivering them; a tradition to which however little weight can attach.[2] He was

thirdly, with the import of the term λόγοισι, which here obviously does not so much mean books, in the material sense, as literary compositions, works of genius. The rare or novel practice (if any) here referred to, is the employment of a special agent to bring certain works into circulation; Hermodorus, as we learn from Cicero, having been empowered by Plato himself to act in that capacity. The just historical inference therefore to be drawn from the adage is, not that the sale of books was unknown or uncommon, but that the circulation of new works was slow, both in Sicily and in Greece generally, in the time of Plato. The same inference may be derived from the story in Plutarch (Nicias, 29.), of the plays of Euripides having been recited as novelties, during the Peloponnesian war, by the Athenian prisoners to their Syracusan captors.

[1] Plut. Vit. Peric. p. 155.

[2] Suid. v. Περικ. It seems to be contradicted by Plut. Vit. Dec. Orr. in Antiph. p. 129. Tauchnitz.

versed in the philosophy of his time, as taught by masters whose lectures were delivered in the city under such protection as he had in his power to afford them against the reigning popular prejudice. He is also said to have turned his scientific attainments to beneficial account in the affairs of the state, by quieting the alarm which eclipses, and other natural phenomena, created among the more simple-minded citizens; and which so often interfered with the conduct of important public enterprises. He was an accomplished musician; and, though not described as having himself cultivated poetry, was a zealous patron of that branch of the art which chiefly flourished at Athens. The national enthusiasm for scenic entertainments placed the popular dramatic writers comparatively beyond the necessity of the kind of patronage which it is usually in the power of rank to bestow. But such as Pericles had at his command was liberally accorded, and appropriately combined with that encouragement of the arts of design for which he is also deservedly celebrated. Among other great architectural works, he built a noble theatre. He also obtained a law, granting to every Attic citizen the price of his admission to the performances, and extended or embellished the festivals with which scenic representations were connected. He may indeed be said to have called into requisition the resources, not merely of Athens, but of all Greece, in rendering his native city what he justly boasted her to be in his day, the metropolis of Greece in science and civilisation. For the treasures expended by him in his efforts to secure her this distinction, were in great part the produce of the taxation enforced by Athens, under his guidance, on her Hellenic allies; ostensibly as the price of their

protection from the common enemy, but more truly for the aggrandisement and embellishment of the dominant state.

That the exertions of this prince of demagogues, in the promotion of elegant pursuit, if not more sincere, were more disinterested than those of the enlightened despot of the preceding age with whom he has been compared, may be inferred from the different treatment received by each from those for whose behoof their liberality was displayed. The affairs of the state, which supplied so many favourite subjects, serious and comic, to the popular Greek writers, were in the time of Pericles, as in the time of Pisistratus, available for such purposes, only in so far as was agreeable to the rulers of the state. But, in the latter case, the ruler of the state and the patron of literature were the same person. The talents promoted by him were exercised under the control of his body guard. The case of Pericles was different. Even the patronage was but in part at his disposal, being largely shared by the democracy, while the whole censorship was in the hands of that body; and, among the modes in which their right to both offices was asserted, two of the most popular were: first, to make their political chief a favourite butt of their poetical satire; secondly, to call him severely to account whenever his exercise of the joint privilege interfered with their own passions or prejudices. One can indeed hardly grudge father Demus the pleasure he derived from the ridicule thrown by the comedians on Pericles, when we consider that he equally enjoyed their attacks on himself. As long as he was amused any license was permitted to others. But when Anaxagoras, the friend of the same

Pericles, ventured to teach sublime truths which clashed with the popular superstition, both the philosopher and his patron were speedily made to feel, that the many-headed monarch of the Pnyx was as jealous of his own despotic rights as the sternest tyrant of any previous dynasty.

His connexion with Aspasia.

10. There is perhaps no event in the life of Pericles which better displays the enlightenment of his own character, his influence over his countrymen, the boldness with which he exerted it, and the obstacles interposed to his success by national prejudice, than his connexion with the celebrated Aspasia. Allusion has already been made[1] in these pages to the narrow spirit with which the Athenian citizen enforced his own political and intellectual ascendancy, even to the degradation of those objects which, next to his republican rights, were nearest and dearest to his affections. There was one portion of the Attic mind, certainly no ignoble one, which can hardly be said to have had any share whatever in that brilliant development of Hellenic genius in which Athens now takes the lead, — the portion which fell to the lot of the women. A limited participation in the graver orders of literary entertainment connected with certain religious festivals appears to have been allowed them. But from those advantages of a high state of social culture, which consist in the rational intercourse and interchange of ideas between the educated men and women of a great European metropolis, they were altogether debarred. Their social enjoyments, like their social duties, were confined to the seclusion of their own apartments; their power to the government of their

[1] Vol. III. p. 304. sq.

servants; their talents to the administration of their household affairs. The union between Pericles and the fascinating stranger who had selected Athens as the fairest field for turning her accomplishments to account, gave him an opportunity of combating these national prejudices such as it is not likely any alliance with an Athenian lady could have afforded. Aspasia was promoted by him to the privileges which the wife of the first citizen of a civilised community ought to enjoy. She presided at his table, and, to use the modern phrase, did the honours of his house, attracting and delighting his guests with the charms of her conversation and address. Had any high-born Athenian dame been his accomplice in this attempt to innovate on so delicate a point of Athenian manners, the result could hardly have been other than such a loss of her own credit in the eyes of her peeresses, as would have been an obstacle at the outset to any influence of her example upon their conduct. Aspasia, on the other hand, on being virtually raised to the rank of an Athenian lady, could at least forfeit nothing of the character she formerly possessed, by retaining her previous social habits in her new position. It is fair therefore to infer, that an enlightened desire to enlarge the views of his fellow-citizens as to the just rights of the female sex, had as much influence as his own passion, in inducing Pericles to raise Aspasia from the rank of his mistress to that of his wife.[1]

The experiment, however, was not successful. The

[1] The formal or legal marriage of an Athenian citizen with a foreigner was prohibited; but, considering the facility with which even a legal marriage could be dissolved, the connexion between Pericles and Aspasia may be esteemed, morally speaking, quite as valid a matrimony. The only essential difference was, that it did not legitimise its offspring.

force of antient custom was too strong. A few of the Athenian ladies went the length of joining the circle of Aspasia; none it would appear ventured to open a similar circle in their own mansions; and the public voice was raised in loud and threatening tones both against the author of the innovation and his fair accomplice. After the death of Pericles, we hear nothing of the social influence of his widow; or of any other attempt, during the flourishing age of Greece, to break through the almost oriental restrictions on the free intercourse of the sexes in Athens.

Among the other Hellenic sovereigns or statesmen who here merit special notice as patrons of learning and literature, the most enlightened and munificent was Hieron of Syracuse (478—467 B.C.).[1] His court was the favourite resort of the leading poets and philosophers of his age; of Æschylus, Simonides, Pindar, Bacchylides, Epicharmus, Xenophanes; several of whom were honoured with his personal friendship, as well as his royal hospitality. The two Dionysii of Syracuse, who afterwards successively held sway in the same city and over a great part of Sicily and Italy, in the first half of the fourth century B.C., have also pretensions to rank as encouragers of letters. The elder Dionysius was himself an author, and on several occasions gained the tragic prize at Athens; but whether the award was due to his merit as a poet, or to his monarchal dignity, may be a question. Neither father nor son has much claim to that real appreciation of genius by which Pericles and Hieron were distinguished; and the men of letters whom they entertained at their court are said, Plato among others, to have been as often the sport of their

Hieron.

The Dionysii.

[1] Smith's Biogr. Dict. II. p. 254.

jealousy and caprice, as the objects of their favour or generosity.

Macedonian kings.

Several of the early Macedonian kings were distinguished patrons of men of letters. Euripides, his fellow-tragedian Agathon, Chœrilus the epic poet, and Zeuxis the painter, were honourably entertained by Archelaus (413—399) at his court, where Euripides permanently settled and spent the latter part of his life.[1] Socrates[2] also received, but declined, a pressing invitation from the same monarch, to participate in the honours conferred by him on other distinguished Athenians. His successor Amyntas II. is reported, but on less valid authority[3], to have afforded hospitality to Hellanicus, Herodotus, and Euripides; and this monarch's son, Perdiccas the II., is described as an enthusiastic patron of men of science.[4]

The two last and greatest Macedonian monarchs of this period, Philip and his son Alexander, have less claim to rank as patrons of literature in the proper sense, although both availed themselves in their councils of the services of philosophers celebrated for knowledge of the arts of government, or experience in

[1] Hermesian. ed. Bach. p. 158.; Diodor. XIII. 103.; A. Gell. XV. 20.; Ælian. V. H. II. 21., XIII. 4., XIV. 17.; Schol. Aristoph. Ran. 85.; Athen. VIII. p. 345. D.

[2] Aristot. Rhet. II. 23. § 8.

[3] Suid. v. Ἑλλάνικος. The notice of this compiler is here, as usual, full of blunders. It is, however, probable, that with the authority from whom he borrowed, the Amyntas referred to was not, as modern commentators have assumed, the first sovereign of that name, who died before Hellanicus was born; but, as here supposed, his grandson, Amyntas II. This Amyntas, it is true, did not acquire the supreme power in Macedonia until 394 B.C., after the death consequently of the three authors who are described as his guests. He seems, however, previously to have enjoyed, during upwards of thirty years, in a more or less independent capacity, the sovereignty of certain provinces of Upper Macedonia, inherited from his grandfather, Alexander I. Thucyd. II. 100.: conf. 95. and I. 57. 59.

[4] Caryst. ap. Athen. XI. p. 506. 508.

the affairs of life. Aristotle resided habitually at the court of Philip as preceptor to Alexander, and the latter carried with him on his campaigns, as confidential advisers, Callisthenes and Anaxarchus. But the functions of Anaxarchus seem to have been little more than those of court flatterer; and the fate of Callisthenes, whom Alexander disgraced, imprisoned, and according to some accounts tortured to death, on a vague charge of implication in a conspiracy against his person, proves that respect for men of learning had but little influence in modifying in the mind of the conqueror the passions to which it was habitually subjected.

In the ensuing more detailed treatment of the literature of the Attic period, a priority in the order of arrangement will be given to prose, and more especially to history, over other branches of composition. Among the several inducements to this method may be urged, that it is in the rise and popularity of prose that the fundamental feature above pointed out as distinguishing the Attic period from that which precedes, the ascendancy of the intellectual over the imaginative faculty, most broadly displays itself; and it is obviously desirable that we should at once be enabled to apprehend this distinction in its full extent and influence. It is further apparent, that the closer insight into the political annals of any nation to be derived from an examination of its historical literature — the early prose writings of every country being chiefly of the historical order — must tend greatly to assist any future estimate of the other contemporary productions of national talent.

# CHAP. II.

## ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION.

1. FIRST ESSAYS IN PROSE WRITING LONG PRECEDE A POPULAR PROSE LITERATURE. LAWS. RHETRÆ OF LYCURGUS. DRACO. SOLON. PELOPONNESIAN ARCHIVES. — 2. RISE OF POPULAR PROSE COMPOSITION. CADMUS. PHERECYDES. ACUSILAUS. EUMELUS. ARISTEAS. EPIMENIDES. — 3. RESTRICTION OF EARLY GREEK POETICAL HISTORY TO MYTHICAL SUBJECTS. — 4. CAUSES OF THAT RESTRICTION. SIMILAR RESTRICTION OF EARLIEST PROSE HISTORY. FIRST APPLICATION OF PROSE TO PHILOSOPHICAL SUBJECTS. — 5. GEOGRAPHY THE MOTHER OF AUTHENTIC HISTORY. ARISTEAS OF PROCONNESUS. ANAXIMANDER AND HECATÆUS OF MILETUS. SCYLAX. — 6. GENEALOGICAL LITERATURE. FIRST ESSAYS IN AUTHENTIC HISTORY. CHARON OF LAMPSACUS. OTHER EARLY HISTORIANS. — 7. GREEK TECHNICAL CHRONOLOGY. EARLIEST CHRONOLOGERS. CHARON OF LAMPSACUS. HELLANICUS. OLYMPIC REGISTER. — 8. DEFINITION AND ORIGIN OF THE OLYMPIC ERA. HIPPIAS. ARISTOTLE. TIMÆUS. — 9. OLYMPIAD OF CORŒBUS. OLYMPIAD OF IPHITUS AND LYCURGUS. IDENTITY OF THE TWO. — 10. PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE. ITS SLOW PROGRESS. — 11. RHETORIC. THEAGENES OF RHEGIUM. RHAPSODISTS. SICILIAN MASTERS. SOPHISTS. DEFINITION AND CHARACTER OF. — 12. GORGIAS. PROTAGORAS. PRODICUS. HIPPIAS. EARLY ATTIC ORATORS. THRASYMACHUS. THEODORUS. GRAMMATICAL WORKS. — 13. MISCELLANEOUS PROSE LITERATURE. FABLE. ÆSOP. OTHER BRANCHES OF POPULAR PROSE. — 14. GREEK PROSE STYLE. STYLE AS DEPENDENT ON DIALECT. EARLY IONIC PROSE. ITS VARIETY OF USAGE. — 15. ATTIC PROSE. — 16. STYLE AS DEPENDENT ON STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION. "SENTENTIOUS" STYLE. — 17. "PERIODIC" STYLE. GORGIAS. LYSIAS. PERFECTION OF ATTIC STYLE. LATER VICISSITUDES OF IONIC STYLE. A DEFECT OF THE CLASSICAL ATTIC STYLE.

1. In the present chapter it is proposed to trace the origin of Greek prose writing, and the several stages of its progress down to the close of the fifth century B.C.; that being the epoch at which we first find it generally adapted to the various orders of polite com-

position, as comprised under the heads of History, Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Miscellaneous literature.

The inquiry into the rise and early practice of prose writing has been commonly confounded with that relative to the cultivation of prose as a branch of popular composition. The two questions are however essentially distinct, and a right understanding of the distinction is indispensable to the accurate treatment of this entire subject.

First essays in prose writing long precede a popular prose literature.

Attention has already been directed[1] to the causes which obtained for poetry a precedence in the order of cultivation over the sister style of literature. The harmony of metrical numbers was required, not only to gratify the taste of a primitive audience, but also as an aid to the memory of the author, in an age when other means of preserving his works were unknown or scanty. The same cause would naturally tend to retard any more general application of the art of writing to the art of poetry, even after the technical facilities for the purpose became more plentiful. The two essential requisites of a national literature, promulgation and preservation, being already in a great degree provided for in the manner most agreeable to the primitive public, there was the less inducement to resort to more artificial expedients; although it is probable that these also would, from the earliest epoch at which a supply of them was at hand, be turned to account for the private convenience of professional reciters.

Prose composition on the other hand offered no aid to the memory, and in its pristine form no charm to the imagination. It must therefore have been dependent, from the first, for its transmission, or indeed

[1] Vol. I. p. 145. sq.

for its very existence, on the art of writing. It was in fact, in its origin and essence, the first application of that art to purposes of utility; and writing being itself, in the strictest sense, an art of practical utility, invented for the recording of what could not be recorded by other means, it follows that the use of writing and the composition of prose must have been coeval. From the earliest existence of the former art, all documents of importance connected with civil government or social life, laws, state decrees, chronological records, private contracts, or epistolary communications, would as a general rule be embodied in prose, and by consequence committed to writing. Such documents would thus, in the natural course of events, become comparatively abundant, long before it occurred to the public which framed them to treat, in the same unattractive forms of language, those subjects of a more ideal character which had, in the spirit of the age, been set apart as the more peculiar province of poetry. Prose writing consequently, in this more elementary sense, may be assumed not only to have been practised in Greece centuries before the first dawn of a popular prose literature, but even to have preceded any general use of the art of writing in poetry, already provided with a more congenial mode of preservation. It may claim therefore to rank as the most antient branch of literature, taking the term literature in its primary sense of an application of letters to the record of facts or opinions.

The epoch at which this application first took place in Greece remains, like the first introduction of writing, involved in obscurity. This much however may safely be asserted, that by whatever sage or hero the alphabet was communicated to the Hellenes, whether

by Cadmus, Danaus, Palamedes, or some other more real personage unrecorded, from that epoch the Hellenes must have been in the habit of writing prose. The first successful essays in popular prose literature cannot, on the other hand, be traced beyond the sixth century B. C., an age many generations posterior to that at which, on any reasonable estimate, those primitive improvers can be supposed to have lived. But the use of writing for strictly useful or necessary purposes, from the 9th or 10th century B. C. downwards, is established on other than mere speculative or fabulous data. The dispatches alluded to by Archilochus[1] as habitually conveyed by the Spartan scytale in his time were assuredly written in pithy Laconic prose; nor can there be any reasonable doubt that the letters which Homer in the Iliad describes as carried by Bellerophon from Prœtus of Corinth to the king of Lycia, and as fraught with many calumnious imputations against the bearer, were, in the poet's estimation of them, if not in reality, primitive specimens both of alphabetic writing and of prose composition.[2] The codes of the early Greek lawgivers quoted by Aristotle, of Philolaus, Phidon, and Lycurgus (in so far as the enactments of the latter were committed to writing), were also prose documents of the eighth and ninth centuries B. C.[3]

Laws.

That the Rhetræ, or fundamental statutes of Lycurgus, were written in prose is established, not only by the testimony of the best authors[4], but by the evidence of one of those statutes which has been preserved. The genuine character of this relic is undoubted. It was known to, and commented by,

Rhetræ of Lycurgus.

[1] See Vol. III. p. 453.
[2] Vol. III. p. 484. sq.
[3] Vol. III. p. 460. sq.
[4] Vol. III. p. 457. sq.

Aristotle; and its rude, even to that acute critic, but partially intelligible Doric, guarantees it as a monument of the remotest Spartan antiquity. It is certainly a curious fact, that this, the oldest authenticated example, not only of Greek prose composition but of the art of writing in Greece, should be the production of the Greek state which above all others was proverbial in historical times for its illiterate habits. The interest which, on these various grounds, attaches to the fragment, will be a sufficient apology for here subjoining it entire, with such a translation as the obscurity of the text will admit.[1]

Διος Συλλανιου και Αθηνας Συλλανιας ἱερον ἱδρυσαμενον· φυλας φυλαξαντα, και ωβας ωβαξαντα τριακοντα· γερουσιαν συν αρχαγεταις καταστησαντα ὡρας ἐξ ὡρας απελλαζειν μεταξυ Βαβυκας τε και Κνακιωνος. Οὑτως εισφερειντε, και αφισταsθαι γαμωδαν γοριαν η μην και κρατος.

Having dedicated a sanctuary to the Syllanian Jove and the Syllanian Minerva; having divided the citizens into their tribes, and classed them into their thirty classes; having installed the kings and the senate in their functions, let them hold assemblies from season to season, between the river and the bridge.[2] Thus let the laws by them be proposed or withdrawn. Let the power to confirm or reject belong to the people.[3]

This primitive ordinance contains in its dry Laconic phraseology the essence of the political constitution of Sparta. Had we the other rhetræ in a like state of integrity, we should find doubtless the social and military organisation of the people similarly provided

[1] Plut. in Lyc. 6. [2] So rendered by Aristotle, ap. Plut. loc. cit.

[3] The last part of the text is corrupt. We have endeavoured to convey the spirit of the most plausible restoration. See Müller, Dor. III. 5. 8.

for. The meagre simplicity of the enactment illustrates the Lycurgean dogma inculcated in another rhetra[1], but certainly not observed to the letter in after times, that the Spartan laws, the details that is of legislation, were not to be written but on the hearts, or in other words, on the affections and habits of the citizens.

Draco — Solon.

The next in antiquity among the remaining specimens of early Greek prose, also belonging to the legislative style, are the fragments of the laws of Draco and Solon.[2] These cannot be considered as having retained, to the same extent as the Laconian rhetræ, the dialectical forms in which they were composed; but their general structure, which, we are assured in several instances by the authors who cite them, has been faithfully transcribed from the original as it existed in their day, has much of the concise simplicity of the Doric statute.[3]

Peloponnesian registers.

The other authentically recorded documents of the same practical nature, the dates of which preceded the rise of popular prose literature, but of which no remains exist, appertained chiefly to Peloponnesian states. Such were the registers[4] of the Spartan kings, and other Peloponnesian princes or magistrates; those of the priestesses of Juno Argiva; and those of the Carneonicæ, or victors in the Carnean games of Sparta. Such was the inscription on the very antient Elean monument commonly called the

[1] Plut. in Lyc. 12.

[2] Plut. in Sol. 19.; Æschin. adv. Timarch. p. 32. sqq.; Demosth. adv. Makart. p. 1071.

[3] In both is observable that quaint employment of the imperative mood which maintained its ground more or less in the later practice of the Greek states, and reappears in identically the same form in the Roman XII tables.

[4] Supra, Vol. III. p. 431. sq.

disk of Iphitus[1], cited by Aristotle, and which commemorated the establishment of the Olympic games as a Panhellenic festival. Plutarch further assures us that the more antient oracular responses of the Delphic Pythoness were in prose[2], and his statement seems to be confirmed by the fact of the rhetræ, which were all assumed in Spartan tradition to be edicts of the Pythian Apollo, being written in that form. It is true, on the other hand, that the greater part of the more antient oracular responses which have been transmitted are in hexameter verse.[3] It may, however, be a question whether this was in every case the mode in which they were delivered by the Pythoness. The inspiration of that gifted female was not the inspiration of a poet, but of a prophet. Amid the multiplicity of applications to her shrine, it is hardly possible that she could have been provided with extemporaneous metrical responses to the inquiries of every devotee. There is therefore reason to believe that many of those oracular odes or epigrams, cited by Herodotus and other pious chroniclers, are, in their existing form, poetical paraphrases, prepared by local versifiers from the original prose responses, for the greater facility of general promulgation.[4] The sententious doctrines of the Seven sages, engraved on metal plates in the Delphic sanctuary, were also in prose, although, according to popular Greek custom, such epigrammatic lessons were used to be couched in verse. The departure from ordinary usage in the present case may indicate

Oracles.

[1] Vol. III. p. 423. [2] De Pyth. Or. p. 404. A.: see Vol. III. p. 458.

[3] The collection of Herodotus, however, offers some very remarkable exceptions: IV. 163., VII. 169., V. 89. 67., VI. 34.

[4] This seems also to be stated by Plutarch. De Pyth. Or. p. 404. A. conf. 396. D.

a rise of taste about that time, among professional philosophers, for more practical methods of inculcating their doctrines. Their mathematical studies must also have required a familiar habit of prose composition.

Rise of popular prose composition.

2. Thus far concerning the early use of prose writing in the practical business of life. In passing on to the further inquiry regarding its first cultivation as a branch of polite literature, we are met on the part of the popular authorities by the same subtle spirit of system, of which we have already had experience in treating of the early history of poetical composition, and which, from an over-anxiety to simplify, often tends still further to complicate and obscure the questions on which it exercises itself. It was a standard doctrine of the popular Greek antiquaries, that every art or custom, even the most elementary, and such as could hardly fail to spring up simultaneously with the first efforts of a nation to emerge from barbarism, must have had some inventor, or what is nearly equivalent some importer from abroad. When the custom was one of recognised remote antiquity, the title to priority was usually awarded to some mythical hero. In regard to arts connected with a certain advance in civilisation, such as the various styles of literary composition, the ordinary method was, in each case, to assign the honour of invention to the oldest extant author whose works offered specimens of that style. The invention of the Hexameter verse, for example, was not ascribed to Homer, even by those who recognised his works as the oldest Greek poems; because that metre, being admitted to be the most antient, was understood to have been common to earlier fabulous poets whose works were lost. Its invention was

ascribed accordingly to one or other of those mythical bards. But in regard to the remaining orders of poetical metre, the first author ascertained to have employed them was usually classed as their inventor. Thus the Iambus, though bearing internal evidence that it is, like the Hexameter, the spontaneous fruit of the primitive muse, was "invented," according to some by Archilochus, according to others by Simonides, the two authors whose works offer the first specimens of the measure; and a similar method was pursued in respect to other varieties of lyric measure.

The same principle was applied to the case of prose composition, but with this distinction that the inquiry was here tacitly limited to prose as a branch of polite literature; no account being taken of the rhetræ, laws, and monumental registers, above noticed as written in prose centuries before its accredited inventors were born. Three authors possessed claims to have achieved this important step in the progress of literature, Cadmus of Miletus, Pherecydes of Syros, and Acusilaus of Argos; all being more or less contemporaneous, and flourishing about the middle of the sixth century B.C.[1] Cadmus is perhaps on the whole the more favoured candidate of the three. By some, however, his merit was restricted to his having extended the new art to historical narrative, while the title of Pherecydes to have first practised it, as limited to his own philosophical department of composition, was considered preferable.

Cadmus — Pherecydes — Acusilaus.

The age and real existence of Pherecydes and

[1] Compare Suid. vv. Κάδμος, Ἀκουσίλ., Φερεκύδ., Ἑκαταῖος; Joseph. contr. Ap. I. 2.; Diog. Laert. I. c. xi.; Plin. Hist. nat. v. 29., VII. 56.; Solin. c. 40. and Salmas. ad loc.; Dion. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 23.; Strabo, I. p. 18.

Acusilaus, with the genuine character of the works ascribed to them, are established on reasonable data. With Cadmus the case is different. It is not pretended that any work by him had been preserved; nor, if we except his Milesian nativity, has any particular of his life or fortunes, possessing an appearance of historical reality, been recorded; while, in the more detailed notices of his biography, his affairs are so blended with those of the Bœoto-Phœnician Cadmus, as to warrant the suspicion of his being but a later reflexion of that hero.[1] The creation of a second, Milesian, Cadmus might the more readily suggest itself to the popular adjusters of Greek literary history, from the circumstance that the Milesian school of prose composition, as represented by its real authors, Anaximander, Hecatæus, and others, possessed, as a school, a marked precedence in age and popularity over every other. The hero therefore who, as the Bœotian Cadmus, acts as inventor or importer of the alphabet, might naturally be reproduced as the Milesian Cadmus, to act as namefather of the new, more extended application of the alphabet to literary purposes. The title of his only reputed work, "On the primeval history of Miletus and Ionia," a work which there is no reason to believe ever existed but in name, is in keeping with the ideal character of the author. The tradition of its having been epitomised by Bion of Proconnesus[2], a later historian of whose existence or labours but faint vestiges can be discerned, tends the more to invalidate the belief of its having ever been written. It is not to be supposed that any such

[1] Suid. v. Κάδμος; Dion. Thrax, ed. Bekker, p. 781.; Villoison, Anecd. Gr. vol. ii. p. 187.

[2] Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. p. 629.

early rude attempt at historical composition could have been of so great length or minuteness of detail, as to suggest material for abridgement to a successor. Bion's Epitome may, therefore, be classed with other cases of not uncommon occurrence in the legendary annals of Greek poetry, where authors of historical times are charged with having pirated or paraphrased lost works of Orpheus, Musæus, and other fabulous bards.

The question however, as to the precise age of Cadmus, or his rival inventors, is one of little real moment in its bearings on the rise of popular prose literature in Greece. Any such formal limitation of the first essays in that style to a single author or epoch, can here as little as in other similar cases of "invention," be taken by the letter. It can but indicate, at the most, the date at which the art of composing prose works had arrived at such maturity as to admit of the works themselves, or the names of their authors, being transmitted to posterity. The first beginnings of every such art or pursuit are lost in obscurity; and it is as little probable in itself that the earliest preserved specimens of prose history should have been the first attempts of the kind, as that the Iliad should have been the first heroic poem, or the Theogony of Hesiod the first metrical catalogue of Hellenic deities. Nor does any such right of priority in favour of an individual appear to have been recognised in the present case, but on the part of authors writing under the influence of this same sophistical theory of "invention." In various incidental passages of respectable classics, allusion is made to prose compositions of a much earlier age than that ascribed to either Cadmus or Pherecydes. Eumelus for example,

the Corinthian poet of the eighth century B. C., is cited as author of a prose work on the antiquities of his native city.[1] Similar compositions were attributed to Epimenides[2], to Aristeas of Proconnesus[3], and to various other writers flourishing, or supposed to have flourished, prior to the accredited era of the Milesian inventor. There is indeed good ground of belief, that all or most of these works were supposititious.[4] But the notices concerning them suffice not the less to show that the common sense of the Greek public prescribed no such dogmatical limits to the antiquity of prose literature, but assumed its origin, as has here also been done, to be involved in the same obscurity as that of other elementary arts or sciences.

Eumelus of Corinth.

Aristeas—Epimenides.

3. Before offering any remarks on the properties by which the new style of composition was distinguished on first emerging from obscurity, attention is called to a peculiarity in the history of Grecian literature incidentally noticed in a former page[5], but the full illustration of which was reserved, as there stated, for this part of our subject. That peculiarity consists in the exclusive preference shown by the Greek epic poets, during the whole Poetical period, for subjects borrowed from the age prior to the occupation of Peloponnesus by the Dorians. This event dates in the received chronology eighty years after the Fall of Troy, and nearly six centuries before the first ascertained specimen of prose history. These six centuries comprise certainly a period of great national importance and interest, both political and

Restriction of early Greek poetical history to fabulous subjects.

[1] Vol. II. p. 450.
[2] See Vol. II. p. 469.
[3] Suid. v. Ἀριστ.; Dion. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 23.
[4] Conf. Dion. Hal. loc. cit.
[5] Vol. III. p. 433.

social; the period during which took place the final settlement of the various families of Hellenes in the seats which they afterwards permanently occupied; during which all the essential elements of Greek social economy or civil government were developed, and in many instances matured or perfected. Yet the affairs of this entire period are passed over in complete silence in the voluminous compositions of its authors. The centuries thus neglected were especially remarkable as comprising the flourishing age of the Ionian and Æolian colonies, in which their poets were the leaders of the popular school of epic composition. But there is no trace of any one of them having borrowed his subject from that age, nor is an allusion to any event or person connected with it to be detected in the extant remains or citations of their works. To the Ionian poet and his public, the struggles of their ancestors in defence of their antient Peloponnesian possessions against a semi-barbarous invader, or their final expulsion from those possessions, or the reestablishment of their fortunes in the more valuable territory conquered by them on the eastern side of the Ægæan, or the victories over the native powers by which that conquest was achieved, seem to have been all matters of profound indifference. Their whole sympathies continued to be engrossed by the legends of the ante-Dorian age; and posterity, in so far as dependent on the native epic minstrelsy, would never have known that the Ionian coast had been conquered by Greek adventurers, or that such cities as Ephesus, Chios, or Smyrna had ever been founded.

Still more unaccountable is the case of their European, especially their Dorian, kinsmen, of the mother

country. It was quite natural that an Ionian or Æolian poet should take a warm, though not so exclusive an interest in the fabulous wars and triumphs of his ancestors; that Agamemnon and Troy, Amphiaraus and Argos, should still occupy at least an honourable place among his subjects of celebration. But it is difficult to see what similar attractions those subjects could hold out to a Dorian poet of Peloponnesus; to the poet of a nation which never pretended to have thrown a spear on the banks of either the Asopus or Scamander, and whose greatest achievement, the single source of their power and celebrity, was their conquest of the territory of those boasted Argive and Pelopidan heroes. All reasonable probability would lead to infer, that to the poetical annalists of the Dorian conquerors, the legendary glories of the men whom they had routed and driven beyond sea would have been subjects of contempt rather than enthusiasm; and that their own favourite themes would have been their victories over the supplanted race. But instead of this, we find the Dorian organs of tradition as busily engaged from the earliest period in glorifying Thebes and Troy and the Pelopidæ, as were Arctinus or Lesches on the Æolian and Ionian coast. Nor in the remains of their works is there a symptom of their own conquests, or their consequences, having supplied them either with a principal subject or with an episodical allusion.

This anomaly appears still more strange as exemplified in the genealogical order of epic poets, than in those of the cyclic or heroic school. After the affairs of Greece were again settled down, and the new occupants of Peloponnesus began to identify

their feelings and interests with those common to the Hellenic body at large, it would have been nothing remarkable that a certain taste should spring up among them for the legends of the old wars against foreign races, with the glories of which the patriotism of their fellow-Hellenes was so warmly associated, and which had been celebrated by their own now favourite poet, Homer. But that the authors of those dry genealogical compilations, which seem to have found special favour with the Dorian public, should also have limited their subjects to the ante-Dorian period, and in a great degree to its Achæo-Ionian heroes, is most unaccountable. Perhaps the most distinguished author of this genealogical order was Eumelus of Corinth, himself a Dorian of noble descent, member of one of the chief families of a leading Dorian state.[1] His most popular work was entitled Corinthiaca, and described the origin and early vicissitudes of his native city. But the portion of its history with which alone he or his fellow-citizens had any personal concern was excluded from his text. He enlarges on the foundress Ephyra, and her descendants Corinthus, Sicyon, and Marathon; on Sisyphus, Medea, Jason, and the Argonauts; on the Atridæ and the Cecropidæ, in their connexion with Corinth. But like all his fellow-Dorian annalists of the same age, he stops short where it was most natural for him to have begun, at the conquest of Corinth by his own ancestors. Similar is the case with his contemporary Cinæthon of Lacedæmon.[2] Of the Lacedæmonian genealogies of Cinæthon we know less than of the Corinthiaca of Eumelus; but

[1] Vol. II. p. 447.: conf. 261.

[2] Vol. II. p. 447.: conf. 264.

such knowledge of them as we possess tends to show that Sparto-Dorian history had no share in their contents. What has here been said applies equally to the historical poetry of other parts of Greece; to the Genealogies of Hesiod, the Naupactica, and other similar compilations, illustrated in a previous volume.[1]

Causes of that restriction.

4. In the few remarks offered in another[2] place on this strange peculiarity of Greek literary history, a hope was intimated that some explanation of it might be supplied by our present researches into the rise and early progress of prose composition, especially of its historical department, which so nearly connects itself with the genealogical school of poetry. Neither from this source, however, nor from any other, has such an explanation offered itself as can, by reference either to the general laws of society, or the analogy of other times and countries, be considered satisfactory. There is, no doubt, a strong tendency in the human mind to seek for subjects of heroic celebration by preference in remote ages: recent events, even when in themselves replete with romantic interest, being apt to derive from their very connexion with the realities of life, a certain commonplace character, which renders them less congenial either to the inspiration of the poet or the taste of a popular audience. But in ordinary cases this tendency only displays itself in a marked manner in periods of advanced civilisation, when, the memory of such recent and real occurrences being fully provided for by the more artificial resources of literature, they appear in broader forms of unpoetical contrast to the

[1] Vol. II.

[2] Vol. III. p. 432. sq.

ideal glories of legendary antiquity. Such, however, was not the state of society in Greece during the first centuries of her history subsequent to the Dorian conquest, a period which, to the eye at least of the modern historian, offers all the essential characteristics of a poetical age. Nor in the literature of any other country can an example be discovered of any such conventional line of distinction between the age of poetry and that of reality. The poets and romancers of our own heroic minstrelsy love no doubt to dwell on the fabulous chivalry of the Round Table or the Sangreal; but they do not despise the better authenticated achievements of Tancred and Cœur de Lion, of the Cid, of Bruce and Wallace, of Douglas and Hotspur.

The only special causes of this anomaly which suggest themselves in the case of Greece are: first, the peculiar character of the Dorian revolution, which forms the conventional limit of her heroic age; and secondly, some idiosyncrasy in the imaginative element of the Greek mind, which rendered it susceptible, in an unusual degree, to the influence of that spirit of distinction, which we have above endeavoured to illustrate, between the poetical and the real, as dependent on the times and seasons of events. The conquest of Southern Greece by the Dorians, with the ensuing settlement of the Asiatic colonies was, as already remarked, the event which first established Greek social and political existence on a permanent basis. From that epoch, the interests of life seem to have presented themselves to the fastidious fancy of the Greek poet under colours of naked human reality which disqualified them for heroic celebration. Great men were no longer fabled

the sons of Gods. The conduct of enterprises was considered to be more immediately in the hands of human agents, and less subject to the control of supernatural beings. The connexion between the heroic and the religious element of mythology, which forms in every age so characteristic a feature of Greek poetical literature, in proportion as it was relaxed in the new era, became more strongly riveted in favour of that which preceded, and helped more sharply to define the line of demarcation between the two. Another cause of the distinction may be found in the increasing prevalence, from the Dorian conquest downwards, of the habit of noting events in writing, with the greater security which a more settled state of society afforded for the preservation of written records. For in every age, especially among so imaginative a people as the Greeks, the written notation, even of bare names, dates, or facts, has a tendency to remove them from the category of subjects adapted to poetical treatment. Without, indeed, some such written notation, it were scarcely conceivable how the details of Greek history, from the Dorian conquest downwards, could have been preserved even in the imperfect state of historical continuity in which they have reached us, amid the entire want of a popular prose literature on the one hand, and on the other hand amid the exclusive devotion of the poetical chroniclers to subjects of the ante-Dorian era. Mere oral tradition can effect little by itself in any such case where not embodied in verse. It may, however, prove an efficient secondary means of perpetuating the particulars of events, where their main substance is recorded in some form of written register, sufficient, however meagre, to secure them

against the more licentious alterations to which popular legend, when free from such control, cannot fail to subject them.

Similar restriction of early prose history.

Such being the state of Greek historical literature prior to the sixth century B.C., it might naturally have been expected that a main cause of the rise or spread of prose composition about that time, would have been an increased sense on the part of the more intelligent public, of the want of some better mode of recording real events than was provided, either by those meagre registers, or by the vague commentaries of oral tradition. It might have been supposed, that one of the first undertakings of an ingenious master of the new style of composition would have been a digested narrative of the history of his country, from the commencement of the historical age down to his own time. Here then we are met by another anomaly little less perplexing than that which we have just been endeavouring to explain; and which supplies further proof of the singular difficulty which the Hellene experienced, in transferring any portion of his tastes from the imaginative to the practical pursuits of literature. For these early cultivators of the new style, Cadmus, Acusilaus, and their contemporaries, far from directing their talents to any such useful ends, were content to borrow their subjects, as exclusively as the old metrical genealogists, from the mythical ante-Dorian period. Their compositions were in fact little more than prose paraphrases of those antiquated performances.[1]

It is not very easy to understand how any intelligent author should have sought popularity by composing, or any public have taken pleasure in perusing,

[1] Clem. Al. Strom. I. p. 629.: conf. Strabo, I. p. 18.

in the meagrest forms of colloquial idiom, for to style in the higher sense the early prosaists had little pretension, the same mythological common-places with which, even as served up in the poetical forms most congenial to popular taste, the national appetite might be supposed to have long since been satiated. As no entire work of any one of these logographers or legend-writers, by which title they have been not inappropriately distinguished[1] from the historians of real events, has survived, our knowledge of their mode of treating their subjects is but imperfect. Judging, however, from their remains, and the notices of their commentators, their claims to preference over their poetical predecessors rested on a nicer discrimination in the choice, and a more didactic method in the arrangement, of the common mass of materials. The old genealogical poet, selecting his subjects by preference from the legends of his own locality, or working up those of a more panhellenic character in the mode most agreeable to his native audience, had been contented to embody the whole in the simple form of a continuous narrative. The prose logographer presented the same, or a similar body of tradition to his readers, in the shape of a digested historical system, interspersed perhaps with remarks on conflicting versions of the same legend, with reasons in favour of that followed by himself, and with interpretations of the allegories contained, or supposed to be contained, in the more marvellous portions of his narrative.

First application of prose to

The prose work however, which, among those extant in later times, advanced the best title to antiquity,

[1] Chiefly by modern scholars; but the term seems to be used in this sense by Dionys. Hal. I. 73. and Polyb. VII. vii. 1.

philosophical subjects.

that of the elder Pherecydes, can hardly with strict propriety be classed under the head of logography. That term, while applicable no doubt in its wider sense to the prose treatment of all popular tradition, was in familiar usage limited to its more strictly human element. The work of Pherecydes, on the other hand, was devoted to the purely religious or cosmogonical mythology[1]; and may be considered as standing in the same relation to the poetry of Hesiod or Orpheus, as the compositions of Cadmus Milesius and Acusilaus to the old genealogical minstrelsy.

Geography the mother of authentic history.

5. The first recorded application of popular prose to the treatment of practical subjects is in the department of geography. Geography may therefore rank as the mother of history in Greece; taking the term history in its higher sense, as limited to such subjects. Hence, during the early ages of Greek prose literature, history and geography usually went hand in hand; the political vicissitudes of each people being illustrated by some description of the country which it inhabited. Even in the old epic minstrelsy, the catalogue of the Iliad for example, geographical description preserves, in the midst of fable, features of substantial reality, such as cannot be recognised either in events or persons. There can also be little

Aristeas of Proconnesus.

doubt that the Arimaspia of Aristeas, the first known specimen of a geographical poem, which appeared about the time of the earliest logographers, and is frequently quoted by Herodotus[2], contained, with all its legendary extravagance, a large element of fact. The travels there described, extending over the less explored parts of northern Europe, could only have

[1] Didot, Frgg. Histt. Gr. I. p. xxxv.

[2] IV. 13. sqq., III. 116.: conf. supra, Vol. II. p. 470.

been undertaken under the auspices of the Greek colonies on the shores of the Euxine. Those colonies were founded chiefly by Miletus, a city distinguished at that period among the Hellenic states for the zeal and extent of her colonial undertakings. To Miletus consequently this enterprising traveller was directly or indirectly indebted for any better knowledge of, or access to, the countries of the interior. The claims of the same Miletus to priority in the literature of geography, are no less substantially upheld by her two citizens, Anaximander and Hecatæus, the latter of whom (B.C. 520—479) is the first Greek prose author who obtained popularity or celebrity as a national classic. The singular apathy exhibited during so many ages by the Greek race to the more intellectual branches of literature, may thus be said to have finally given way before that spirit of commercial enterprise which, in every age, has proved so effectual a stimulus to national talent.

Anaximander, and Hecatæus of Miletus.

Anaximander, who flourished contemporaneously with Pherecydes and other accredited "inventors" of prose style, is the first recorded constructor of a map of sufficient compass or accuracy to have obtained for him the reputation of inventor of that branch of the art of design.[1] It seems doubtful whether this work was accompanied by any written text, beyond the names of the principal localities, which assuredly could not have been wanting.[2] The merit of bringing the literary department of geographical science to a similar state of maturity belongs rather to Hecatæus, Anaximander's younger contemporary, distinguished both as a geographer and

[1] Agathem. I. 1.

[2] This much seems to be implied by Diog. La. (in Vit.) II. c. ii.

a historian. His best and most popular work was his Itinerary, or Description of the earth; and several of the extant citations of it seem to imply that its text was arranged in the order of a commentary, or descriptive illustration of the map of Anaximander.[1]

Scylax. The title of Hecatæus to rank as the first prose writer on geographical subjects is, however, contested by Scylax of Caryanda[2], a contemporaneous Ionian Greek, employed by Darius Hystaspes to sail down the lower course of the Indus to its mouth, and thence along the southern coast of Asia to Egypt. In this enterprise he succeeded, and on his return published an account of his voyage, which is now lost; the work that passes current under his name being confessedly supposititious. But the genuine narrative is quoted by Aristotle, and seems to have furnished Hecatæus with some of the materials of his more distant oriental geography. The progress which geographical research had made at Miletus about this time, appears further from the account given by Herodotus[3] of the map which Aristagoras, another noble citizen of that republic, when on a political mission to Lacedæmon, exhibited to the Spartan king Cleomenes. As Aristagoras and Hecatæus were joint councillors of their fellow-citizens at this crisis of Ionian affairs[4], there is the greater reason to believe that the map used by the former on his Spartan mission was substantially the same constructed by Anaximander, and commented by Hecatæus. The copy of Aristagoras was engraved on a brass plate, and comprised the whole earth with its seas and rivers. The portion of its contents specially

[1] Agathem. loc. cit.: conf. infr. Ch. iii. pt. 1.
[2] Infra, Ch. iii. pt. 1. [3] v. 49. [4] Infra, Ch. iii. pt. 1.

referred to by Aristagoras in his interview with Cleomenes, was the line of Persian provinces extending eastward from the coast of Ionia to Susa; and Herodotus seems to have considered the localities and their distances to have been correctly noted.

Genealogical literature.

6. How slow the Muse of history was in following up this commencement of a more rational exercise of her talents, is curiously illustrated by the character of both the works of Hecatæus, of his Itinerary above mentioned, and of that entitled Histories or Genealogies. The former contained notices, generally, it would appear, correct, of the localities visited, of their physical features, and, from time to time, of any peculiarities in the manners of their inhabitants. In treating of foreign nations, in whose annals no such marked line between mythical and real existed as that which the Dorian revolution formed in those of Greece, his attention seems also occasionally to have been turned to matters deserving the name of historical in the better sense. But in regard to Greece herself, all such rational spirit of research seems to have been excluded. The historical information vouchsafed relative to any city or district of that country never extended, judging from the copious extant remains of the text, beyond the name of the mythical founder — usually the same as that of the place itself — with an incidental reference to any more prominent fabulous adventure of which it may have been the scene. The materials of his genealogical work were exclusively derived from the heroic age.

Dionysius of Miletus, a contemporary of Hecatæus, is quoted as author of a geographical treatise of a similar nature. Another work ascribed to him, on

slender authority[1], under the somewhat ambiguous title, "On the events subsequent to Darius," would, if genuine, entitle him to rank as the first Greek writer of real history. But the accounts of this author are scanty, and he is so often confounded with later writers of the same name, as to render more than suspicious the genuine character even of the compositions ascribed to him under his distinctive gentilic of Milesian. Of the other logographers contemporaneous with, or little junior to, Hecatæus and Dionysius, about the close of the sixth, or early part of the fifth century B.C., the following, — Eugeon of Samos, Deïochus and Bion both of Proconnesus (the latter the reputed epitomist of the Milesian Cadmus), Eudemus of Paros, Democles of Phygela, Amelesagoras of Chalcedon, Simonides of Ceos, and Xenomedes of Chios, — all appear to have treated exclusively of mythological subjects.[2]

First essays in authentic history. Charon of Lampsacus.

Less questionable than that of Dionysius is the title of his younger contemporary, Charon of Lampsacus (B.C. 500—450), to the honour of first Greek historian of real events. His works seem, indeed, to have been chiefly devoted to this more rational class of subjects, and are described as going over much the same ground afterwards more fully occupied by Herodotus.[3] From this time a fair amount of attention was given by the early prose writers to the realities of history; although by most of them the old mythical subjects still continued to be treated, and by some exclusively preferred. Those who, among the immediate successors of Charon, possess claims to rank as historians in the better sense were[4]:

[1] Suid. v. Διονύσιος.
[2] Infra, Ch. iii. pt. 1.
[3] Infra, Ch. iii. pt. 1.
[4] Infra, Ch iii. pt. 2.

Xanthus the Lydian, Hippys of Rhegium, Antiochus of Syracuse, Hellanicus of Lesbos, and Damastes of Sigeum. Hellanicus appears to have been the only author prior to Herodotus, who compiled a continuous series of Hellenic history from the earliest age to his own time. Pherecydes of Leros, on the other hand, a contemporary of Hellanicus, and one of the most popular writers of his class, preferred the old mythical order of subjects. Another contemporaneous historian of the same logographic order was Herodorus of Heraclea.

Other early historians.

The names of several other authors of works belonging to the general head of History might be added to the list above given; but as the greater part of their compositions, including those which formed the chief source of any celebrity they may have enjoyed, were of a different character, such notice of them as may be required will be reserved for another place. Two writers, however, of this miscellaneous order, Stesimbrotus of Thasos and Ion of Chios, deserve to be specially mentioned, as having originated those useful and agreeable branches of historical composition which may be classed under the head of biographical and historical Memoirs. Of a Biography in the stricter sense, or complete life of an individual, there is no authentic trace prior to the Alexandrian era.

The method in which all these early historians treated their subjects is described, by a distinguished antient critic[1] who possessed their works entire, as more or less crude, desultory, and unconnected. As such it is contrasted by him with the epic unity and comprehensiveness of Herodotus; who, in regard both

[1] Dionys. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 5.

to composition and style, stands to them much in the same relation as Homer to the popular ballad-singers of the infant epic literature. Nor can the more essential characteristics of the early logographic school be better conveyed to the reader's apprehension than in the words of the same critic:

"The method of all these authors, both in the selection and the treatment of their subjects, was much the same. The history of each nation or city, Greek or Barbarian, was taken up separately, with little or no connexion between the affairs of one and those of the other; the object of each writer being, apparently, but to place the materials collected by him, in the form in which he had received them, without addition or curtailment, before his public. Herodotus first imparted life, vigour, and elegance to the dry facts of history, by compiling and arranging the annals of many nations and times into one great and comprehensive narrative."

Greek technical chronology.

7. In concluding this general view of the stages by which Greek historical literature passed from infancy to maturity, it will be proper to notice another peculiarity, for which it was remarkable during its flourishing age, and in which it contrasts unfavourably with the same branch of composition as cultivated by other nations inferior to the Hellenes in inventive genius or precision of intellect. Prior to the commencement of the Alexandrian period, when history, with the other standard orders of polite composition, had already passed its culminating point of excellence, there existed among the Greeks no common national era for the computation of time or the settlement of dates. In the literature of Rome this want, if ever experienced, was soon supplied. From the earliest

epoch at which we have any trace of the Romans having cultivated history as an art, their chronology was regulated by the era, real or fabulous, of the foundation of their city. A like method is understood to have been followed by their predecessors in civilisation, the Etruscans. The nations of modern Europe, during their barbarous age, adopted, and have since employed, the era of the establishment of their religious faith. The Mahometan historians date in a similar manner; and although we possess no such clear insight into the method pursued by the Egyptians and the leading oriental nations of antiquity, there is reason to believe that their historical annals were regulated by fixed chronological standards. The deficiency in the case of the Greeks may be ascribed, in part perhaps, to the same subdivision of national feeling formerly noticed[1] as the source of other more favourable characteristics of their intellectual culture. The same causes which contributed to keep alive the spirit of constitutional independence in each state, and with it the separate cultivation of its native dialect and favourite styles of composition, would also help to maintain its attachment to its own mode of computing time, and a disinclination to defer to the method of a neighbour or rival. That most of the states had their own local systems there can be little doubt; and, in regard to some of those of higher rank, we have competent evidence that such was the case.

But although the citizens of each republic may have felt a patriotic partiality for their native practice, men of letters do not seem to have been restrained by this consideration from selecting such

[1] Vol. I. p. 117. sqq.

other methods as might appear to them better suited to their object. The first recorded attempt to adjust historical narrative on a chronological basis is the work of Charon of Lampsacus, entitled Annals of Lacedæmon, or Lacedæmonian magistrates[1]; understood to have contained a genealogical list of the Spartan kings, with notices of the events by which their reigns were signalised, digested according to the years of those reigns. The adoption of a Spartan system of chronology, in treating of a strictly Spartan subject, was natural, even on the part of an Ionian author. But when we find Hellanicus of Lesbos[2], a younger contemporary of Charon, regulating the chronology of a comprehensive work on the general history of Greece, according to the succession of the priestesses of the Argive Juno, so systematically as to have procured for the book the title of "Argive priestesses," we are naturally led to assume that the same Argive chronicle enjoyed some superior credit over those of either Lesbos or other states. That it did enjoy such peculiar credit appears both from its epochs having been deferred to by the neighbouring state of Sicyon[3], and still more from their having been adopted by Thucydides[4], in conjunction with those derived from the years of the Lacedæmonian Ephori and of his own Attic Archons, on the few occasions on which he attempts any general definition of time. The ordinary mode of computation followed by the same Thucydides is the simplest and meagrest possible, that by years of the war which forms the subject of his history. Herodotus shows no acquaintance with any com-

Earliest chronologers.

Charon of Lampsacus.

Hellanicus.

Thucydides.

Herodotus.

[1] Infra, Ch. iii. pt. 1.
[2] Infra, Ch. iii. pt 2.
[3] Plut. de Mus. III.
[4] II. 2., IV. 133.

mon standard for the computation of time. His method of dating events, if such it can be called, is altogether vague; sometimes by their priority to his own age; sometimes by the intervals at which they are removed from each other; sometimes by the epochs of particular kings or dynasties, whose ages or lengths of reign, if adjusted with any degree of precision in themselves, stand in no determinate relation of time to other similar groups or successions of historical personages, who figure in the wide field of action over which his narrative extends.

Carneonicæ of Hellanicus.

Hellanicus, it may be added, also compiled and arranged a chronicle of the victors in the Carnean musical festival of Sparta, from the epoch of its establishment in 676 B.C. But this compilation seems to have been limited to its own immediate subject of Musical history, and not to have been employed for chronological purposes in the wider sense.[1]

Olympic register.

Hellanicus also appears to have recognised the date of the first establishment of the Olympic games, as a standard epoch or era.[2] But there is no trace of any similar knowledge or recognition, either by him or any contemporary author, of what are called in later times the Elean parapegmata, or registers of the victors in the Olympic games; which system of dates, in the latter part of the fourth century B.C., when the Greek public at length became alive to this defect in the mechanism of their historical literature, was selected as providing the most efficient remedy, in preference to other methods

[1] Infra, Ch. iii. pt. 2.

[2] African. ap. Euseb. Pr. Ev. x. 10. p. 489. A.; Hellan. frag. 62. Didot, conf. frag. 90.

partially sanctioned by previous usage. There can be no doubt that the preference was judiciously bestowed. While the regular returns of this great festival supplied a far more precise system of computation, than either the genealogies of kings or the succession in office of public functionaries, it was also an essentially national, rather than a local system, and connected with the associations and sympathies of the whole confederacy. The question then which occurs is, not so much how it came ultimately to be adopted as a national standard, as how it did not happen to be adopted sooner. And this suggests another question: whether in the time of Hellanicus, Herodotus, or Thucydides, there existed any Olympic register, in a form similar to that in which we find it embodied during the Alexandrian period of literature. If it did exist, was it known to those authors? And, if known to them, how are we to explain their indifference, or that of their age, to its advantages; which must, every four years, have been pointedly brought under their notice?

Definition and origin of the Olympic era.

8. It may here be proper to remark, for the sake of those not fully conversant in the details of such questions, that the era, or starting point, of the Olympic system of chronology, was the year which corresponds to 776 B. C. of our calendar. In that year the Olympic games were believed to have been, if not first instituted, first regulated in the form in which they were celebrated in later times; and from that year, the returns of the solemnity at fixed intervals of four years were understood to have been uninterruptedly continued. Every such quadrennial interval constituted a chronological olympiad; so that the period from olympiad I. to the Christian

era, embraced 194 olympiads: and the four years comprised in each olympiad were reckoned, respectively, as the first, second, third, and fourth years of that particular olympiad. It is, however, by no means to be assumed, as frequently has been by modern commentators, that the employment in later times of a technical system of chronology, comprising a certain number of such returns of a national solemnity, necessarily implies the actual existence of that solemnity, still less the notation of its epochs, from the year at which, in the technical system, it professes to date. Such a system, it is obvious, might have been, and frequently has been, constructed retrospectively, apart altogether from any ascertained antiquity or constancy of the basis on which it was founded. Let us suppose, for example, the Olympic register to have been first framed by Aristotle, about or shortly after whose time it appears to have obtained currency. It would have been quite competent for him, by a simple process of calculation, to construct it on the same plan on which we find it afterwards employed, without the certainty of a single Olympic date prior to his own birth having been noted at Elis. He had only to assume, it matters not whether upon historical evidence or in deference to popular tradition, that the Olympic games had been established in a given year, — say 440 years before his own time, — on the same plan of quadrennial epochs on which they continued to be celebrated. This first year he would constitute the epoch of the first olympiad; the fifth, ninth, and thirteenth succeeding years, would be those of the second, third, and fourth olympiads. The compiler's own epoch, or that of the execution of his scheme,

would be the hundred and tenth olympiad; and upon this framework all previous dates of national history, as recorded in already existing monuments, might be adjusted with as great regularity as if the system had actually existed during the whole period which it theoretically embraced. Had it seemed to the compiler that the era of the festival could with propriety be fixed some centuries further back, in 1000 B. C. for example, it is evident that his register might, with equal facility, have been adjusted on that more extended basis.

But the Olympic chronicle of the Alexandrian period was not merely an ordered succession of quadrennial epochs. Each of those epochs was signalised by the name of one or more of the successful combatants in that particular celebration of the games. The addition of these names[1] could not have been provided for, like the succession of epochs, by a mere process of calculation; nor is it to be supposed that a compiler of credit would supply such materials from the resources of his own imagination, as readily as he might construct an imaginary theory of dates on a historical basis. It is true however, on the other hand, that there might have existed fabulous lists of Olympic victors adapted to equally fabulous periods of the solemnity, just as there existed in every Greek state successions of fabulous kings or priests. The connexion consequently of particular names with the remoter epochs of the festival, would be evidence of its celebration at those epochs, only in so far as the connexion and the celebration could be shown on authentic grounds to be real and contemporaneous.

[1] See the list of those which have been transmitted in Krause's Olympia, p. 236. sqq.

The construction, however, of any such artificial system of chronology, while it might readily occur to the literary men of the Alexandrian era, was less likely to suggest itself to those of the previous century; especially to authors such as Herodotus or Thucydides, who were not professional chronologers, but popular historians, with whom the computation of time was but ancillary to the narrative of facts. Had however any such system existed at Olympia in their day, in a form at all approaching to that in which we find it promulgated some generations afterwards, it is certainly not probable that, in feeling their way towards a better adjustment of dates, they would have overlooked so convenient and strictly panhellenic a mode of computation, in favour of such vague and comparatively local registers as those of the reigns of Spartan kings, or the succession of Argive priestesses. It has indeed been assumed by modern commentators, that the name of each Olympic victor was inscribed in a register kept at Elis for the special purpose by the Hellenodicæ, or Judges of the games. There is, however, no proof that those functionaries were under any obligation to keep such a register, or that any such existed, at least during the Attic period. Impartiality in awarding their decisions was their imperative duty; but it does not appear that they were further bound in every case to perpetuate the fame of the successful combatants. They would be careful perhaps to enter in their own Elean archives the names of Elean victors; or those of victors belonging to states with which they were on terms of friendly alliance. But they might naturally, in other cases, leave the task of commemorating the triumph to those who had the merit of achieving it.

We have in fact specific ground of belief, that no such continuous register existed in the fifth century B.C.

Hippias. It appears that Hippias, the celebrated Elean sophist, had, among his other literary enterprises, undertaken, if not to constitute the Olympic quadrennium a chronological system, to compile at least a catalogue of Olympic victors; and Plutarch[1], from whom we derive this notice, adds, that "the compilation was worthy of no confidence, as not being founded on authentic data." It seems impossible to reconcile this remark with the fact of there having existed at Elis, in the time of Hippias, any systematically digested chronicle of the victors in the games. Hippias was himself a citizen of Elis; and, if not a man of very profound learning, he was yet a man of acknowledged talent, and one of the most successful literary adventurers of his age. His popularity seems also to have been especially great in his native city, where he resided; and in the Olympic sanctuary, which he honoured as a favourite scene of his rhetorical exhibitions.[2] It cannot therefore be supposed that, in undertaking such a compilation, he would have neglected to avail himself of the original documents preserved in his own birthplace; or that he would have found difficulty in obtaining access to them. Had those documents comprised an authentic register of the victors in the games, all that would have been required, in order to insure credit to his compilation, would have been to transcribe that register; and no defects of his commentary could have destroyed the value of his principal text to such a degree as to justify the sneer of Plutarch. In fact Plutarch him-

[1] In Numa, 1.

[2] Plat. Hipp. Min. p. 363.

self, in the remark introductory to his notice of Hippias, distinctly states it to be his own opinion, that in the time of that author the materials for such a work did not yet exist in a digested form. After dwelling on the uncertainties of early Greek chronology, he adds: "the adjustment of dates, consequently, was a difficult matter, especially that of the dates of Olympic victors, a list of whom is said to have been first published by Hippias of Elis, but one founded on no trustworthy data."

But although Elis itself may not have possessed any complete series of Olympic registers, or even a sufficient body of materials for its construction, there can be little doubt that a copious stock of such materials, partly in that locality, partly in other states of Greece, would be at the disposal of the archæologer who possessed a greater degree of industry to search them out, and of capacity to turn them to proper account, than seems, with all his accomplishments, to have fallen to the lot of Hippias. An Olympic victory was considered among the proudest achievements of a Hellenic citizen, conferring honour, not only on himself and family, but on the state to which he belonged; and as there was no distinction more highly prized, there seems to have been none more carefully commemorated. There existed, accordingly, a large number of inscribed monuments, either in the form of statue or stela, as well in Olympia itself as in other Greek cities, recording the names of successful combatants, and specifying, in however imperfect a manner, the epoch at which the success was obtained. We possess no clear data as to the time when, or the person by whom, these miscellaneous materials may have been compiled into

a chronological system. But all the notices on the
Aristotle. subject point to Aristotle. Among his works was one entitled "Olympionicæ," or Olympic victors[1]; the first of the kind of which mention occurs since the abortive attempt of Hippias. As Aristotle was not a historian in the proper sense, there is the greater reason to believe that his compilation partook more of a chronological than a historical character; though combining probably biographical notices of the victors with an adjustment of the epochs of the festival. That he had here, as in other cases, gone deeply into the subject, and carried his researches back to the fountain head by an examination of the oldest monuments, especially of those preserved at Olympia, appears from his having quoted, among other such authorities, the very ancient inscription on the "disk of Iphitus," to which attention will be further directed in the sequel. It may also be inferred from the appeals made to him[2] by Eratosthenes and other later chronologers of good credit, in doubtful points of detail connected with the lists, that his authority was great in questions of the kind. In the
Timæus. next generation, Timæus, the Sicilian historian, was author of a tract on the same subject, under nearly the same title. He appears also to have adopted the Olympic system of dates[3], already, it must now be presumed, in a full state of maturity, in his great historical work; and from this time it seems to have been generally received, as the standard system of classical chronology.

Olympiad 9. It remains to offer a few remarks on the ques-

[1] Diog. Laert. v. § 26.; conf. Fragg. Aristot. Didot, p. 182.
[2] Fragg. sup. cit.
[3] Suid. v. Τίμαιος; Polyb. xii. xii.; conf. Diod. v. 1.

tion: How it happened that the year selected as the epoch of the first olympiad should have been precisely that corresponding to the year 776 before the Christian era. The natural and obvious answer would seem to be, that this was the year when the games, which, according to the mythical legend, had formed part of the local rites of the Olympic Jove from the remotest antiquity, had been first formally established and inaugurated as a national panhellenic solemnity. That such was, in fact, the motive of the selection will be shown in the sequel. But this was not the popular doctrine of the later chronologers. By them the same first national institution of the festival was dated at a considerable but vaguely defined interval prior to the first olympiad (776 B.C.) of the chronological series; the era of which was assumed, in the same equally vague theory, to have been marked by the circumstance of its having been the first celebration of the festival the victor in which had been recorded by name. The person enjoying this distinction was Corœbus of Elis, after whom, accordingly, this first olympiad of the chronological series is also occasionally designated the Olympiad of Corœbus.

of Corœbus.

In all the notices on the subject, differ as they may in other respects, the first historical institution of the games is described as having taken place under the auspices of Iphitus king of Elis, and Lycurgus the Spartan legislator. According, therefore, to the popular doctrine, which placed a long interval between that first institution and the olympiad of Corœbus, it would follow that Lycurgus and Iphitus flourished long prior to the latter epoch. The traditions concerning the age of both these personages are

Olympiad of Iphitus and Lycurgus.

so conflicting, as at first view almost to bewilder the inquirer in his attempts to form any positive opinion on the question. But a more careful analysis of them can leave no reasonable doubt that the earlier and graver authorities were either ignorant of, or opposed to, the popular view of a two-fold era of the games; that they made the era of Lycurgus and Iphitus coincident with that of Corœbus; and identified, by consequence, the epoch of the first historical institution of the games with the first olympiad of the chronological series. The inconsistency, on the other hand, of the remaining testimonies on the subject, and the improbabilities which they involve, are, as we shall also endeavour to show, such as to deprive them of all historical value.

Identity of the two.

Thucydides[1] places the legislation of Lycurgus in 804 B.C. This date would be quite compatible with the legislator's having been the founder of the Olympic era of 776 B.C. at a more advanced stage of life; but would not be compatible with his having founded another Olympic era in the early part of the ninth century B.C., as stated in the popular accounts. Assuming him to have been thirty-five years of age in 804 B.C., he would have been but sixty-three in 776. Aristotle accordingly, our oldest authority on Olympic chronology, and assuredly the highest on any such subject, made Lycurgus and Iphitus contemporaneous, and joint institutors of the games in 776 B.C.; and he further described them as having commemorated that institution, together with that of the Ekechiria, or Sacred truce, observed during the celebration of the festival, by a votive disk, the inscription on which the philosopher had examined and

[1] I. 18.

recognised as genuine.[1] Pausanias, after stating Iphitus, the founder, and Corœbus, the first victor in the games, to have been contemporaneous, and their Olympic era to be one and the same, supplies what seems to be conclusive evidence of this identity, in the terms of the inscription still legible in his time on the tomb of Corœbus; where that victor is described as "the first of all men who conquered in the Olympic games."[2] As every celebration must necessarily have had its victor or victors, this specification of Corœbus as the first victor proves at least that his descendants, by whom the monument was erected, were ignorant of any celebration prior to his time; an ignorance which may safely be taken as evidence that none had yet been held. We have thus in favour of the opinion that the olympiad of Lycurgus and Iphitus was identical with that of Corœbus all the oldest and best testimonies: we have that of the immediate descendants of Corœbus himself; that of Aristotle, the first author of a critical digest of Olympic dates; and that of Thucydides, to the effect at least that Lycurgus was contemporaneous with the Olympic era of 776. To these may be added others of less weight, but not to be lightly set aside; that of Pausanias above quoted, a diligent investigator of such questions, and more disposed to exaggerate than reduce the antiquity of remarkable epochs; those of Solinus[3], of Athenæus[4], and of Phlegon[5] of Tralles, a professional writer on the

[1] Plut. in Lyc. 1.; Paus. v. xx.
[2] VIII. XXVI. 3.
[3] I. 28.
[4] XIV. p. 635.
[5] This author has indeed commonly been quoted in an opposite sense, as favourable to both a Lycurgean and a Corœbian epoch of the games. But in so far as any inference can be founded on the mutilated remains of his text, his doctrine must have coincided with that of Aristotle. The

olympiads, of no great antiquity, but of considerable credit.

With this body of substantial testimony it were unreasonable to place in competition the eight or ten conflicting statements by miscellaneous writers, on the authority of one or other of whom the epoch of Lycurgus, and his imaginary ante-Corœbian olympiad, might be dated in almost any year of the four centuries between the irruption of the Heraclidæ and the genuine Olympic era. Callimachus[1] places Lycurgus in 828 B. C.; Vellejus[2] in 840; Tatian[3] in 876; Eratosthenes and Cicero in 884[4]; Plutarch[5] about 900; Clemens Alexandrinus[6] in 926; Xenophon[7] in 1080 B. C. The common basis of these discordant results was evidently a prepossession in the mind of the popular public, originating during the political ascendancy of Lacedæmon, as to the great antiquity of the Spartan constitution. It was natural that by

following passage (frag. 1. Didot), *ἐκλειπόντων τῶν Πελοποννησίων τὴν θρησκείαν χρόνῳ τινὶ, εἰς ὃν ἀπὸ Ἰφίτου Ὀλυμπιάδες ὀκτὼ πρὸς ταῖς εἴκοσι καταριθμοῦνται εἰς Κόροιβον τὸν Ἠλεῖον, καὶ ἀμελησάντων τοῦ ἀγῶνος, κ.τ.λ.*, which contains the substance of his doctrine, seems, in so far as it can admit of any specific interpretation, to indicate a period equal to twenty-eight olympiads or 112 years, between Iphitus and Corœbus, as that during which the solemnity, originally in the mythical accounts founded by Hercules and Pelops, had been discontinued altogether; not a period during which it had been celebrated without being registered. In this view of the case Phlegon must be understood to have been among the authors who admitted the existence of two Iphiti; one under whom the games were discontinued, the other by whom they were renewed. Unless we so understand him, the ensuing text, commencing *χρησθέντων δὲ τούτων . . . .*, which describes the reestablishment of the games by Iphitus and Lycurgus, must be in plain contradiction to his previous statement; since the series of olympiads described as so reestablished, on the seventh of which Daïcles of Messene was crowned, is evidently the series of Corœbus.

[1] Ap. Syncell. Chron. p. 196. c. [2] I. 5. [3] Orat. ad. Gr. 41.
[4] Ap. Clem. Al. Strom. p. 336. B., and De Rep. II. 10.
[5] In Lycurg. 29. [6] Strom. I. p. 301.
[7] Repub. Lac. 10.: conf. Plut. Lyc. 1.

those who were under the influence of this prejudice, Lycurgus, the reputed author of that constitution, should be removed back to as remote an epoch beyond the strictly historical age of Greece, as the varieties of tradition might appear to each individual compiler to justify. Xenophon, the type of extreme philolaconism, is accordingly the one who transports the legislator into the densest mists of mythical obscurity.[1]

The more critical of these last-quoted authorities, after the settlement by Aristotle of the year 776 B.C. as the date of the first authentically recorded olympiad, on grounds probably which could not well be contested, and after the same Aristotle had established, on the conclusive evidence of the "disk of Iphitus," the fact that Lycurgus had assisted in instituting the festival, were obviously in a dilemma, between their inability to evade that fact, and their adherence to their own theory as to the remote antiquity of the Spartan legislator. And there can be little doubt that it is to their anxiety to escape from this dilemma, that we owe that strange anomaly of the Alexandrian school, the assumption of two "first olympiads," the one signalised by the Ekechiria, or Sacred peace, the other by the victory of Corœbus. The reality of the former epoch is worth probably about as much as that of the duplicate heroes, Herculeses, Minoses, and the like, whom chronologers of every age have been in the habit of calling into existence, in order to extricate themselves from simi-

[1] Hellanicus also makes the Spartan legislation coeval with the Dorian settlement in Peloponnesus. But, in a more critical spirit than Xenophon, he ascribes it to the contemporaneous kings, Procles and Eurysthenes; and seems to have considered Lycurgus, probably with reason, but as the reformer or extender of the system. ' Frag. 91. Didot.

lar difficulties. Accordingly, in the present emergency, the personalities of both Lycurgus and Iphitus have been freely subdivided by respectable antiquaries, both antient and modern.[1] The more penetrating research of Aristotle led him, in the face of all popular prejudice, to the single right conclusion; and with him we adopt, as the only historical era of the Olympic games the year 776 B.C.; and as the only historical Lycurgus, the founder of that era, and of the Sacred truce, as recorded on the Olympian monumental disk.

Philosophical literature.

10. Hitherto, our general survey of the early progress of prose literature in Greece has been limited in a great measure to its strictly historical department, as being that which first enjoyed general cultivation or popularity, and concerning which we possess the most abundant notices. The other branches, to the consideration of which we now pass on, may be classed under the three heads of Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Miscellaneous literature.

The term Philosophy, in every age one of somewhat indefinite import, will here be understood to comprehend all the higher subjects of moral and physical inquiry; researches into the origin of things, the nature of the Deity, and the operations of the human mind; with the more practical sciences of mathematics, astronomy, and medicine.

Under the head of Rhetoric will be comprised those branches of intellectual pursuit specially cultivated by the rhetors, and by the inferior order of philosophers commonly called sophists. Such,

[1] Timæus, ap. Plut. in Lycurg. 1.; Phlegon, loc. sup. cit.; Cicero ap. Clint. Fast. II. 1. p. 142.

besides rhetoric in the stricter sense, or the art of oratory, were the more advanced stages of educational literature, grammar, logic, and dialectics. The lectures, indeed, of the sophist embraced, or professed to embrace, the elements of almost every kind of literary pursuit.

To the third head, of Miscellaneous literature, belong all the remaining, as yet comparatively limited, branches of composition, not comprised under any one of the previous heads: Familiar narratives and works of fiction; Literary history; Essays on popular statistics, elegant art, and other topics of general interest.

Its slow progress.

There is, certainly, no kind of literary pursuit which appears more immediately dependent for its effectual advancement on the aid of prose writing, than that of Speculative philosophy. Few subjects could hold out less charm to the imagination, less scope to metrical embellishment, or less assistance consequently to the memory. Here then, again, we are met by another of those anomalies, of not unfrequent occurrence in the course of this history; for in no other department of literature is a greater slowness observable to profit by the resources of advancing civilisation. Many of the early philosophers appear not to have committed their doctrines to writing in any form; and many of those who wrote preferred poetry to prose. Thales left no literary work; although his mathematical researches could not possibly have been carried to the extent for which he enjoys credit, without a familiar habit of writing. The authorship of the remaining six of the celebrated Seven sages was confined to poetry of the elegiac or gnomic order. Pherecydes

and Anaximander wrote in prose; but the notices of similar compositions, either by their younger contemporary Anaximenes, or by their more celebrated successor Pythagoras, are very doubtful. Ocellus Lucanus, another early philosopher of Magna Græcia, and Diogenes of Apollonia in Crete, a disciple of Anaximenes, were both accredited authors of prose treatises. Xenophanes of Colophon, founder of the Eleatic school, gave an exclusive preference to the elegiac verse in his numerous and popular works; and his example was followed by two of his most distinguished successors in that school, Parmenides of Elea, and Empedocles of Agrigentum. Zeno of Elea and Melissus of Samos, disciples of Parmenides, wrote in prose; as did also Heraclitus of Ephesus, Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ, and Diagoras of Melos, successor of the latter in the Athenian branch of his school. To Zeno is also ascribed[1] the first introduction of the dialectic style of didactic composition, afterwards so popular with the Socratic teachers. Socrates left no written works; nor does mention occur of any by his reputed instructor Archelaus. Democritus of Abdera was a voluminous writer on philosophical as well as other subjects; but his supposed master Leucippus, founder of the Atomic school, does not appear to have transmitted his doctrines in a written form. Meton of Athens, the establisher of the true length of the solar year, and founder of the Greek practical astronomy, must have left written astronomical tables, accompanied, it may be presumed, by some species of explanatory text; but no citation is extant of any literary work in the familiar sense, either by him or by his con-

[1] Aristot. ap. Diog. La. VIII. § 57., IX. § 25.

temporary and coadjutor Euctemon. Hippocrates, the creator and greatest master of Greek medical science, was author of voluminous and valuable prose compositions.

The above catalogue comprises all the philosophers of note, who flourished prior to the close of the fifth century B. C. Of these one half either wrote in poetry, or are not known to have left any written compositions. No entire work of undisputed authenticity by any one of them, except Hippocrates, has been preserved.

The preference shown by so many of these early sages for a poetical or purely oral mode of promulgating their doctrines, at a time when the progress of letters had provided another method, apparently so much better fitted to their purpose, may perhaps be explained by the circumstance, that their speculations, being devoted in great part to the subject of natural religion, could hardly fail, when carried on with any freedom, to prove at variance with the doctrines of the national superstition. But the popular public of Greece, at this elementary stage of her intellectual culture, was, especially at Athens, now the favourite resort of men of science, jealous of any formal attempt to depreciate that superstition. The zeal of the more enlightened part of the community for the promulgation of truth, was not hitherto met by a corresponding readiness of the mass to profit by their exertions; and the light of science had still to struggle through the mists of popular ignorance. Two expedients offered themselves for evading this obstacle to free discussion, and at the same time the danger of setting public opinion at defiance. The one was

for the instructor to confine his lectures to verbal delivery, which, while it enabled him to limit his audience to those inclined to do justice to his views, deprived informers of the more positive means of substantiating charges of heresy, which would have been afforded by a written promulgation of his theories. The other resource was to veil them under the figurative disguise supplied by the art of poetry; to which mode of publication, from the time of Hesiod and other early teachers of mystical theology, a greater latitude had been conceded in the treatment of such delicate subjects, than could be expected in a formal exposition of similar theories in the language of ordinary life.[1]

Rhetoric.

11. In the departments of prose classed above under the head of Rhetoric, the earliest author whose name has been preserved is Theagenes of Rhegium.[2] He flourished about 525 B.C., and left a commentary on Homer, the first work of its kind which retained its authority in the subsequent more advanced stages of grammatical literature. He may hence be, and was by classical authorities, considered as the father of that literature among the Greeks.[3] There can indeed be little doubt that before his time prose writing had been applied to the critical art, by Pisistratus for example, and his coadjutors, in their Homeric labours. But the literary priority must here, as in other parallel cases, be awarded to the first author of a work possessing sufficient merit, or embodied in so popular a form, as to obtain permanence as a national classic.

Theagenes of Rhegium.

[1] Such in fact is the explanation given in the words of Protagoras by Plato. Protag. p. 316.

[2] Didot, Frgg. Hist. Gr. vol. II. p. 12.; conf. supra, Vol. I. p. 183.; Schol. Aristoph. Av. 823.; Tatian. ad Græc. c. 31.

[3] Ap. Bekk. Anecd. Gr. p. 729.

No notice occurs of any other writer in this department before the middle of the fifth century B.C.; at which time speculative criticism seems still to have been confined very much to commentaries on Homer and other popular poets; and to have been by consequence chiefly in the hands of the Homeric rhapsodists.[1] Among these, Stesimbrotus of Thasos, Metrodorus of Lampsacus, and Hippias of Thasos[2] were the most popular; and the former was author of a written commentary on his favourite poet. The professional musicians, Lamprus of Erythræ, Damon of Athens, and others, seem also at this early period to have combined rhetorical exercises with their own more immediate department of instruction.[3]

Rhapsodists.

The honour of having founded a school of rhetoric belongs to Sicily. Empedocles is described by Aristotle[4] as the "inventor" of that art; but in what precise sense does not appear; for he was not the author of any prose composition. More distinct are the notices of Corax[5], a Syracusan orator and politician, who, at the close of a series of factions by which his native city had been agitated, and in which he had himself borne a prominent part, gave his fellow-countrymen, in a course of lectures, about 460 B.C., the results of his experience in the rhetorical art. He is also the first recorded author of a work on that art; which retained its repute as a classic after the

Sicilian masters.

[1] Plato, Ion. p. 530. sq.

[2] Plat. loc. cit.; Aristot. Poet. 25.; Lysias, Orat. XIII. p. 328. ed. Oxon.

[3] Plat. Lach. p. 180., Alcib. p. 118., Menex. p. 236.; Plut. in Pericl. 4.

[4] Ap. Diog. L. VIII. § 57., IX. § 25.: conf. Quintil. III. 1.

[5] Aristot. Rhet. II. 24., Sophist. Elench. II. 24.; and ap. Cic. Brut. XII. 46., De Orat. I. XX. 91., De Invent. II. 6.; Quintil. II. xvii. 7., III. i.; Zenob. Prov. IV. 82. ed. Gaisf.; Schol. Hermog. ap. Reisk. Oratt. Gr. vol. VIII. p. 195. sqq.: conf. Westerm. Gesch. der Beredsamkeit, I. p. 36. sq.

subject had been treated by writers of greater celebrity and popularity. His instructions seem to have been limited to his native island. But his fellow-citizen and pupil Tisias[1] taught in various other parts of Greece. At Thurium, the celebrated colony of Magna Græcia founded by Athens in 444 B.C., he opened a school[2] conjointly with another Syracusan orator called Nicias. Among his pupils was Lysias of Athens, who afterwards rose to high distinction in his native city, whence he had in his boyhood accompanied his parents to the new settlement; and it is probable that Herodotus, a fellow-colonist of Lysias, may also have been his fellow-disciple. Tisias afterwards visited Athens, and may be considered the first who rendered the Attic public familiar with the newly matured science of technical rhetoric. Isocrates is specially mentioned as his pupil.[3] He is also said, during his residence in Athens, to have contended with his more celebrated countryman and former disciple Gorgias, for the palm of oratorical ability.[4]

Gorgias[5], 485—380 B.C., the next and most distinguished rhetorician of the Sicilian school, was a native of the Chalcidian colony of Leontini, and is described as a pupil both of Empedocles and of Tisias.[6] His lectures, however, were not like those of Tisias confined to oratory, but extended to many other departments of literature. He was, with all his faults,

[1] Auctt. sup. citt.: conf. Pausan. VI. xvii.

[2] Plutarch. Vitt. dec. Oratt. in Lysia. Phot. Cod. 262.

[3] Dion. Hal. de Isocr. 1.

[4] Pausan. VI. xvii.: conf. Plat. Phædr. p. 267.

[5] See the notices of Gorgias in Clinton's Fast. Hell. vol. II.; also an excellent article in Pauly's Real Encyclopädie.

[6] Quintil. III. i. 8.; Satyr. ap. Diog. L. Vit. Emp. § 57.; Schol. Hermog. ap. Reisk. Oratt. Gr. vol. VIII. p. 197. sq.

unquestionably one of the greatest and most successful teachers of prose composition, and was the founder, as will appear in the sequel, of the classical Attic prose style. Almost all the best Attic writers and orators of his own or the succeeding generation are described as having been directly or indirectly his disciples. Gorgias also wrote on philosophical subjects, and with acknowledged ability; though never admitted to the dignity of philosopher in the higher sense. In his philosophical capacity he ranks among the earliest, and was the greatest, of the class of learned men familiarly known by the somewhat equivocal title of sophist; by which title they are also distinguished from the order of philosophers properly so called. Although this title is of considerable antiquity in the more general sense of Man of learning, it is only about the time of Gorgias that it begins to be restricted, in a narrower sense, to a particular class or order of such men. The Greek term sophistes, as distinguished from its root sophos, seems originally to have denoted a person who professionally taught or inculcated learning, as distinct from one who was merely wise or learned (sophos), without affecting or obtaining any public notoriety by his acquirements. In this simpler sense it is applied by Herodotus to Solon, and other contemporary sages.[1] Even in later times, when restricted in its narrower import to the class or order of "sophists," it is still occasionally applied to philosophers and orators of higher rank, to Socrates, Plato, Lysias,

Sophists, definition and character of.

[1] I. 29., II. 49., IV. 95. Occasionally, in a partly figurative sense, to professional instructors in other branches of art, as of music. Plat. Protag. p. 316..

Demosthenes, and others[1], but commonly it would seem in a more or less disparaging sense.[2]

Any detailed examination of the character of this celebrated fraternity, either in their individual capacity, or as compared with the more honourable body of philosophers properly so called, from whom they were somewhat invidiously distinguished, must be reserved for another place.[3] It will here suffice to specify the chief grounds on which the distinction was based. The first was that the sophist combined with his functions, as master of moral or physical science, those of orator and rhetorician; or it may rather be said, that with him the former branches of instruction were subsidiary to the latter, by supplying fertile themes for the display of rhetorical talent. The sophist was always a rhetor, although the rhetor may not always have been a sophist. Hence, while the researches of the philosopher, fallacious as his doctrines might be, were held to be directed to the

[1] See Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. VIII. p. 479. sq.; Grüfenhahn, Gesch. der Philol. vol. I. p. 127. sq.

[2] That, even as applied by Herodotus, the title was somewhat ambiguous, plainly appears from a comparison of his use of the cognate terms *σοφίζεσθαι* and *σόφισμα*. Schweigh. Lex. Herod. in vocc.

[3] It will suffice for the present to refer to Mr. Grote's ingenious and elaborate analysis of this question in the eighth volume of his History of Greece, p. 447. sq., as a valuable contribution to the literary history of the period: although we cannot subscribe to all his views, nor even accompany him the length to which he has carried some of those with which, in a more modified form, we cordially agree. His discussion of this subject is marked by the same defect which pervades so many parts of his able work, that of exaggerating, or overstating, almost every doctrine or theory which he advocates, especially any new or favourite doctrine or theory of his own. But although he may have overstepped the bounds of impartial criticism in the very flattering picture which he has drawn of the character and influence of the sophists, he has effectually exposed the injustice with which they have been treated, both by the leading disciples of the Socratic school in their own age, and by the great body of modern critics and commentators.

discovery of truth and the promotion of knowledge, the philosophy of the sophist was considered rather as a medium for the exercise of that argumentative subtlety, and those powers of composition, on which they prided themselves even more than on solid learning or sound doctrine. They were thus naturally, and to some extent perhaps justly, taunted with being rather pretenders to extent and variety of superficial knowledge, than professors of real learning. Another distinction resulting from this close union of the sophist and rhetor was, that, while the philosopher inculcated his theories in the more practical mode of didactic treatise or dialogue, the professor of the joint arts was accustomed to convey his instructions on every subject in the form of set speeches or declamations.[1] The term oration consequently, when applied to the discourses of these professors, is rarely to be understood in the sense of speech delivered in a public assembly. Their rhetorical compositions were for the most part but literary disputations embodied in rhetorical form; usually delivered in the lecture room before publication; occasionally confined to written circulation. Such are the two harangues which have been transmitted as works of Gorgias, under the titles of Apology of Palamedes, and Encomium of Helen. This species of literary oration retained its popularity in later times, conjointly with the properly forensic practice of oratory. A further distinction, somewhat invidiously commented on by Plato and other Socratics[2], was that

[1] This is aptly put by Philostratus, Vit. Soph. Prœm.: *τὴν ἀρχαίαν σοφιστικὴν ῥητορικὴν ἡγεῖσθαι χρὴ φιλοσοφοῦσαν.* The definition might with equal propriety be extended, or varied, by reversing two of its concluding terms: *τ. ἀ. σ. φιλοσοφίαν ἡγεῖσθαι χρὴ ῥητορεύουσαν.*

[2] Grote, op. cit. p. 482.: conf. supra, note to p. 37.

which stigmatised the sophists as more mercenary than the philosophers; as not only teaching for hire, but as exacting higher sums, and in a more pertinacious manner, than any other class of teachers, for their instructions. Hence perhaps why, as a general rule, the sophists, during their flourishing age, do not seem to have been voluminous writers; their time being much, and more profitably, engaged in lecturing, and in travelling, for the twofold purpose of increasing their gains and extending their fame.

Gorgias.

12. Although the title sophist does not appear before the time of Socrates to have been one of actual reproach, Gorgias is said to have been so jealous of the at best ambiguous honour attaching to it, as to have objected to it in his own case, and preferred that of rhetorician.[1] Nor did he so much profess to be himself a teacher of wisdom, as to instruct others in the art of teaching it by a command of eloquent language.[2] Besides his orations on miscellaneous subjects he was author of a system of rhetoric, and of various works on composition and literary criticism. Among the numerous testimonies to his zeal in the promotion of letters, the most remarkable is that of his younger contemporary Isocrates[3]; who describes him as spending the whole of his unusually long life in travelling from city to city; never establishing a permanent domicile, or undertaking the ordinary duties of citizen in any one state; unmarried and childless; shunning even the enjoyments of domestic life, in order to devote his entire time and attention to his favourite pursuits.

[1] See Plat. Gorg. p. 449. sqq.
[2] Plat. Gorg. loc. cit., Meno. p. 95., Phileb. p. 58.
[3] Orat. de permut. p. 485. ed. Oxon.

As the immediate disciples of Gorgias are mentioned: Polus of Agrigentum; Licymnius, another Sicilian, of uncertain birthplace; and Alcidamas of Elæa, in Asiatic Æolis. Alcidamas inherited the Attic branch of his master's school; and was author of a system of rhetoric, of a treatise on music, and of other works in oratorical form; one of which, Ulysses's indictment of Palamedes, has been preserved. Polus left a system of rhetoric, a treatise on the use of phrases, and a commentary on Homer's catalogue of ships. Licymnius, by some described as the pupil of Polus, by others as his master, also left a work on the art of rhetoric, now the usual bequest to posterity by the professors of that art. His disciples.

The most distinguished teachers of rhetoric and sophistic science next to Gorgias, were his younger contemporaries, Protagoras of Abdera, Prodicus of Ceos, and Hippias of Elis. Though not specified as pupils of Gorgias, there can be little doubt that all three profited by his lessons. All three selected Athens as a favourite seat of their instructions, and are said to have amassed fortunes by their lectures. Protagoras is represented by Plato[1] as glorying in the title of sophist, and is described on the same authority as the first who exacted payment for his lessons; in which case Gorgias must be supposed to have been content with the voluntary offerings of his disciples, as he too is said to have been richly paid for his professional labours. But we have already[2] had occasion to estimate the value of such notices of the first introduction or "invention" of practices which must have sprung up naturally with the state of manners in which they prevailed; and the same Protagoras.

[1] Protag. p. 349.

[2] Supra, Ch. ii. p. 55. sqq.



29873

Plato elsewhere[1] describes the philosopher Zeno, a predecessor or earlier contemporary of Protagoras, as selling his instructions at an exorbitant rate. Protagoras left a treatise on the art of polemical disputation. He also wrote on the higher branches of grammar and criticism, illustrating his doctrines by passages of popular authors; but none of his works have been preserved.

Prodicus. Prodicus showed a greater preference than either Gorgias or Protagoras for subjects of the philosophical order. He was also highly esteemed as a critic and grammarian; especially for his attention to the judicious choice of words in composition, and to the distinction of cognate or synonymous terms. His oration on the Choice of Hercules was one of the most celebrated of the sophistic order; but, with his other compositions, has perished.

Hippias. Hippias was celebrated among his brother rhetoricians for the casuistry of his dialectics, the meretricious pomp of his language, and his ready faculty of composing show speeches on any variety of subject. Although he is said to have written much, both in prose and verse, few of his works appear to have enjoyed permanent popularity, or to have long survived his own generation.

Antiphon. Antiphon, the earliest of the ten Attic orators of the Alexandrian canon[2], was also the first Athenian prose writer whose name has been recorded. He further enjoys in popular quarters the credit of having been the first author of orations delivered, or intended for delivery, in public assemblies or courts of justice.[3]

[1] Alcibiad. I. p. 119. [2] Plut. Vit. Dec. Oratt.; Quintil. III. i.
[3] Diodor. ap. Clem. Alex. Str. I. p. 309.; Philostr. Vit. Soph. I. xv. 2.; Hermogen. de Form. Orat. II. p. 391. ed. 1569.

He has accordingly, on the strength of this priority, been called the "inventor" of the art of public oratory, as distinct from the literary orations of the sophists. His claim to such inventive honours may be restricted, at the utmost, to his having been the first author of strictly forensic speeches of sufficient merit or importance to be judged worthy of publication or general circulation. Forensic oratory must assuredly have been the mother, rather than the daughter, of sophistic rhetoric. The copy could hardly in any similar case have taken precedence of the original; and any such reversal of the natural order of things is the less likely in the present case, that Corax and Tisias, the founders of Greek rhetorical literature, were active politicians, before they had any pretension to be sophists; and that their success as political pleaders was what suggested their coming forward as professional teachers. The specimens of oratory by which they illustrated their doctrines may, therefore, safely be assumed to have been borrowed from the realities of their own political career; and the claims of Antiphon as an "inventor" may be restricted to his capacity of Attic man of letters.[1] They may probably have originated in the circumstance that he was not himself a professional pleader in the courts. His speeches were sold for money to his clients, and were spoken by them or by others in their employment. He is described, and perhaps with reason, as the first who made profit by the sale of such com-

[1] The further statement of Plutarch (Vit. Antiph.), that Antiphon πρῶτος ῥητορικὰς τέχνας ἐξήνεγκε, is, taken by the letter, still more at variance with the better-attested notices of the Sicilian rhetors; and, if worth any thing at all, is the more obviously applicable to Antiphon in his strictly Attic capacity.

modities. The only occasion on which he himself appeared as a forensic orator, is said to have been in his own defence against the charge of treason for which he suffered (411 B.C.). From his time onwards, the preparation and sale of written speeches became a distinct branch of business with professional orators; the increase of litigation in the Attic tribunals, consequent on the increase of wealth, and more complicated social relations, opening up daily a wider and more profitable field for such commerce. Antiphon also composed speeches on purely fictitious cases of litigation, as model specimens illustrative of his system of oratory. Besides his numerous orations, fifteen of which have survived, he left a work on the art of rhetoric, and another entitled Proœmia and Epilogues, treating, it may be presumed, of the proper management of those important parts of a discourse. But both these compositions are lost.

Andocides.

Andocides (467—391 B.C.) is the only other Attic orator of note whose active life falls within the age here set apart as that of elementary Greek prose literature. He is not mentioned as a teacher of rhetoric, nor does he seem to have employed his talents for any other purpose than the promotion of his own political schemes, in the usual forms of attack on opponents or defence of himself, during his long and unprincipled career, on the vicissitudes of which it is no part of our present object to enlarge.

Thrasymachus.

Two rhetors of the sophistic order still remain to be noticed, as having attained distinction within the limits of the fifth century B.C., Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, and Theodorus of Byzantium. The former was esteemed for a peculiar dignity and elegance of sentiment and diction. He was even considered

by grammarians of good authority[1] as the originator of that "middle" class of composition, equally removed from the extremes of simplicity and artifice, of poverty and ambitious display, which, as afterwards ennobled by Plato and Demosthenes, was classed by the antient critics as the perfection of classical prose style. His works, none of which have survived, comprised orations and several treatises on rhetorical science.

Theodorus is noted by Plato and other authorities[2] for the subtlety and florid graces of his style; and was author of a work in which his principles of composition were inculcated.[3] Theodorus.

Among the numerous commentaries, chiefly by Sicilian masters, on the etymology, flexion, and structure of words and phrases, we find as yet no distinct mention of a Grammar in the familiar sense of the term. Nor indeed is there notice of any such work having obtained popularity as a national classic, prior to that produced by Dionysius Thrax about a century before the Christian era. Elementary works of this nature must already have been abundant, as much so proportionally as now, in the hands of schoolmasters and scholars. But the advance of speculative philology was not yet sufficient to admit of their taking rank as literary productions. Lexicons or dictionaries (Onomastica) appear to have become common toward the close of the fifth century B.C. Their contents, however, were limited, as appears indeed to have been the case at every period of classical antiquity, to the collection and explanation of Grammatical works.

[1] Theophrast. ap. Dionys. Hal. De adm. vi Demosth. 3.; conf. Plat. Phædr. pp. 266, 267.

[2] Plat. Phædr. p. 266.; Cicer. Brut. c. 72. [3] Aristot. Rhet. II. 23.

rare or obscure words, phrases, and dialectical idioms. Gorgias[1] and Democritus[2] are the first who, on more or less valid authority, are cited as authors of such compilations.

Miscellaneous prose literature.

13. Under the head of Miscellaneous prose literature, the earliest and most popular branch of composition which offers itself is that entitled Fable or Apologue.

Fable.

A Fable may be defined a concise ethic allegory, inculcating moral truths, by appropriate language and actions ascribed to animals of tempers analogous to those of the human characters which it is the object of the fabulist to illustrate. Attention has already been directed to specimens of such figurative anecdote incidentally occurring in the text of Hesiod, Archilochus, and other early poets. Stesichorus has also been quoted, in his political rather than his poetical capacity, as the author of several apt and elegant fables.[3]

Æsop.

The first and most celebrated professional fabulist among the Greeks was Æsop, a personage whose existence can hardly be considered beyond the reach of doubt, but who, in the notices concerning him, is described as flourishing at the court of Crœsus in the first half of the sixth century B.C. To this Æsop, at the time when fables are first mentioned as a distinct class of composition, were familiarly attributed all those then current in Greece, not excepting such as were extant in the works of authors who lived long before the earliest date assigned to Æsop's birth. Questionable as may be the real existence of an Æsop, there appears no sufficient reason to doubt the fact, which has how-

[1] Jul. Poll. Onom. IX. init. [2] Diog. La. IX. § 48.
[3] Vol. II. p. 393., Vol. III. p. 169. 226. 248.

ever been disputed by modern critics, of a written collection of fables having passed current under his name before the time of Herodotus. That historian mentions his works in terms[1] which can hardly be understood in any other sense than as allusive to such a collection. Nor is it likely that a single individual, real or fictitious, would obtain credit for the whole then existing body of such compositions, on any other ground than as representing the first compiler of them into a written form. A mere itinerant jester, who had been at pains to store his memory with such anecdotes, could hardly have acquired, in the interval between Crœsus and Herodotus, the celebrity as a classical fabulist which Æsop enjoyed in the days of that historian. Aristophanes[2] seems also plainly to cite the fables of Æsop as existing in his day in a collective form. The fact, of which there can be little doubt, that no metrical version of them existed before the time of Socrates, renders it the less likely that they should have acquired so extensive a circulation through any other medium than that of writing.

These fables, with another kindred class of humorous anecdotes, called from Sybaris, the place of their origin or chief popularity, Sybaritic tales[3], in which inanimate objects were similarly endowed with speech, and many of which were probably admitted into the Æsopic collection, appear to have been the only species of prose fiction which had yet been promulgated in a written form. In the cultivation of the politer orders of Miscellaneous literature, the

Other branches of

[1] He is styled λογοποιός (II. 134.), like Hecatæus (II. 143.).

[2] Av. 471.

[3] Aristoph. Vesp. 1260., conf. 1427. 1436.; Ælian. V. H. xiv. 20.; Suid. v. Συβαριτικαί, and Etym. M. v. Συβαρίζειν, who describe them as dramatised by Epicharmus.

popular prose.

early sophists and rhetors have the honour, as might be expected, of taking the lead. Protagoras left a treatise "On the art of government," another "On the art of wrestling;" and one "On the affairs of Hades;" the latter probably in satirical vein, reflecting with as much freedom as the author could venture to exercise, on the extravagance of the popular notions of the world to come. Alcidamas wrote on "music;" which term, in the technical language of the day, frequently comprehends the whole cyclopædia of elegant pursuit.[1] Prodicus is quoted as author of a tract on Agriculture. Stesimbrotus left one on the Mysteries; which appears to have embraced the more abstruse forms of religious mysticism prevalent in foreign countries as well as in Greece. Similar, probably, was the work of Diagoras, entitled "Phrygian lore." Stesimbrotus also left a treatise on his favourite poet Homer; but whether in the form of commentary, or of critical essay, does not appear. His contemporary Metrodorus wrote on Homer, but in what precise form is also doubtful. Hippias, besides the list of Olympic victors formerly noticed, is quoted as author of a treatise On the names of nations. Many of the livelier specimens of rhetorical declamation by sophistic orators might be also entitled, in a modern catalogue of literary works, to rank, in right of their subject, under the head of miscellaneous; though comprised above, in right of their form, under that of rhetoric. Such were the Encomium of Helen, and the Apology of

[1] Every study or accomplishment, that is, belonging to the province of the Muses. As the term is during the whole of this, as indeed every period of Hellenic literature, habitually employed both in the special and in the general sense, it is sometimes not very easy to distinguish which of the two, in individual cases, is to be preferred.

Palamedes, ascribed to Gorgias; such the Choice of Hercules, by Prodicus; such also Ulysses's Charge of treason against Palamedes, by Alcidamas, disciple of Gorgias; an imaginary indictment, suggested no doubt by the imaginary defence of the hero in the Palamedean oration of its author's master. Contemporaneous with the successors of Gorgias, if not himself one of his disciples, was Glaucus of Rhegium, whose work on the early poets and musicians, the first of which notice occurs in the department of literary history, maintained it credit as a classic at every subsequent period.

One of the most fertile among the authors of this time, in works of miscellaneous literature, was the celebrated philosopher Democritus of Abdera B.C. 435. He left treatises, among other popular subjects, on music and poetry; on various topics of critical philology; on Homer; on painting; on agriculture; on historical research; and on the sacred writings of the Babylonians and Egyptians. Though one of the most enterprising travellers of his day, he is not cited as the author of any work on geographical subjects. The most remarkable compositions of this age partaking of the nature of "travels," were by Ion of Chios, the tragic poet; but, as they also partook largely of the character of history, they will fall to be noticed in detail in the ensuing chapter, specially devoted to the latter branch of literature. Critias, the disciple successively of Gorgias and of Socrates, and more famous as a politician than an author, left several statistical works; one on the Polity of Lacedæmon, another on the Polity of Thessaly. The graver portions of these works appear, from the passages preserved, to have been relieved by anecdotes of re-

markable persons, and notices of curious traits of national manners. Critias also left a work on the Poets and Philosophers, of which several valuable fragments remain. The variety of forms which the popular literature had assumed about the close of the fifth century B.C., appears from Plato's familiar citation of a book on the art of cookery by one Mithæcus, as enjoying a standard celebrity in the time of the philosopher; and such works became common from this epoch downwards.[1] Of Epistolary correspondence as a distinct branch of literature during the fifth century B.C., or indeed during any part of the Attic period, no authentic record has been transmitted. Letters must, indeed, have been written and read in abundance; but no such compositions appear to have been collected or preserved as objects of literary or historical interest.[2]

Greek prose style.

14. The foregoing general survey of the earlier vicissitudes of Greek prose literature has been considered desirable, not only as tending to simplify our future more detailed treatment of the separate parts of the same subject, but as bringing under one connected view the principal data for tracing the origin and formation of the classical Greek prose style, which rose into maturity in the latter half of the fifth century B.C. To the standard models of that style every

[1] Plat. Gorgias, p. 518.; Athen. I. p. 4., IV. p. 164., VIII. p. 337.

[2] The passage of Hellanicus (Didot, frgg. 163. sq.) in which Atossa, a Persian empress, is described as the first who carried on correspondence by letter, is far from meriting the importance which some modern commentators have assigned it in connexion with this question. The personage here alluded to is not the celebrated daughter of Cyrus and wife of Darius, but some heroine of the early Assyro-Persian mythology, to whom Oriental tradition awarded the credit of having achieved this step in the advance of literary pursuit.

polite European language has been indebted, immediately or indirectly, for those principles of composition by which its own cultivators have been guided in their efforts to impart dignity or grace to their productions. The investigation consequently of the sources whence those principles are derived, is one of vital importance in its bearings on the history of polite literature, not only in antient Greece, but in the civilised world during every subsequent period.

This subject, which in the history of a modern European literature would present but a single train of inquiry, will here, by reference to the peculiar genius of the Greek tongue, as more fully illustrated in a previous portion of this work[1], fall to be considered under the separate heads of: I. Style, as dependent on dialect; and II. Style, as dependent on structure and composition.

Style as dependent on dialect.

At the close of the Poetical period, about the time of the first popular essays in prose composition, the polite language of Greece presented three principal varieties of dialectical form. The first was the old poetical Ionic or Homeric, still cultivated by the few remaining poets of the now superannuated epic school, and under slight modification by those of the still flourishing elegiac school. The second variety was the more recent Ionic, as exemplified in the iambic poetry of Archilochus, Simonides the elder, and Solon. The third would require, were we treating of Greek poetry, to be considered under the two cognate heads of Æolic and Doric. But as its forms of expression exercised little or no influence on prose literature, nor offer by consequence matter for consideration in this place, it will here suffice to include them under the

[1] Vol. I. p. 117. sqq.

single title of Melic, common to the orders of poetical composition in which they were chiefly employed.

Early Ionic prose.

The more recent Ionic dialect was common not only to the Ionian colonies of Asia but to Attica. Athens was the parent state of those colonies; and although the separation took place at a remote epoch of fabulous antiquity, the antient speech maintained itself in its substantial integrity in the two countries down to the close of the Poetical period; partly by means of friendly intercourse, partly as forming in each the common medium for the cultivation of the more popular branches of literature. That such was the case is attested by the leading antient grammarians[1], and further results from a comparison of the writings of Solon with those of Archilochus and other Ionian poets of the Iambographic school. There can therefore be no doubt that this later Ionic is the source whence the classical Attic of Thucydides and Plato derived its origin; although the stages of the transition may not be easily traced, owing to the entire want, down to the close of the Periclean age, of native Attic prose writers, whose works, had they existed, would have supplied the most satisfactory data on the subject.

The division into dialects is no peculiar feature of the Greek tongue. It is one common to every language spoken by a numerous race of men spread over a varied surface of territory. There is however this difference between the Greek and other polite European languages, that while, in the former, each of the principal dialects enjoyed the benefit of classical cultivation, in the others that privilege has been limited to a single one. The causes of this difference

[1] See Vol. II. p. 205.

have been examined in another place.[1] Its effects will be best illustrated by pursuing a little further the comparison between the literature of Hellas and that of our own age. Whatever variety of pronunciation or form of words may prevail in different provinces of Britain or France, the well educated Englishman or Frenchman writes and spells, although he may have difficulty in pronouncing, according to a single norm of grammar and orthography. David Hume, for example, spoke his native Scotch in great purity, and was in the habit, when conversing with his friends, of using phrases which are not to be found in any English vocabulary, and of pronouncing others in a mode which would have been unintelligible in London. Yet there is no better model of English style than Hume's history. But the Dorian or Æolian author of the flourishing age of Greece was as little ashamed to write, as he was to speak, his native dialect, where he found it best adapted to his purpose; and many of the finest passages of Sappho or Alcman are unintelligible to a scholar who knows no other form of poetical Greek than that authorised by Homer or Sophocles.

Its variety of usage.

But in the midst of this freedom of provincial usage, there may yet be observed, at different epochs, a preference on the part of the nation at large for particular dialects in certain more popular branches of literature, whether from a consciousness of their better adaptation to those branches, or from certain orders of composition having been more successfully cultivated by authors of particular districts. Such a preference was awarded in prose composition, during the earlier stages of its cultivation, to the later Ionic

[1] Vol. I. p. 117. sqq.

dialect. With the exception of a few obscure Italiote or Sicilian writers, who adhered to their native Doric, the historians and philosophers of every district of Greece seem to have written in Ionic prior to the ascendancy of the Attic dialect in the latter part of the fifth century B.C. This was owing chiefly to the circumstance that prose took its origin in Ionia, and that the more popular of its early cultivators were natives of Ionian states. The fashion set by the Ionian Hecatæus was followed by the Æolian Hellanicus and the Dorian Herodotus. Another partial motive for this preference may have been the old family connexion between this dialect and the Homeric; which in every age maintained its ground as a common standard or fountain head of polite usage.

Here, however, another peculiarity of the Greek tongue presents itself, in the variety of forms which not only prevailed in the vernacular use, but were frequently authorised in the classical style even of a single dialect. This appears to have been more especially the case with the Ionic. Herodotus[1] describes the spoken language of the Ionian states in his day as comprising four broadly marked varieties of idiom. One was proper to Chios and Erythræ; another to Miletus, Myus, and Priene; a third to Samos alone; the fourth was common to Ephesus and the five remaining states. It may be questioned whether each or any one of these sub-dialects possessed a distinct classical style of composition, or whether the peculiarities of all may not rather have formed a common stock, from which authors, native and foreign, were at liberty to draw in such proportions as suited their taste, or that of their public. It is very probable, however, that some of the native

[1] I. 142.

Ionian, especially Milesian, writers, may have taken pride in adhering to their local idiom. In regard to Hecatæus, this seems to be indirectly implied by the antient critics who possessed his works entire, and who contrast the purity and simplicity of his dialect with the variety and license of that of Herodotus.[1] The remains of the former writer are unfortunately too scanty to supply any sufficient data for our own judgement: but the extant work of his more celebrated successor offers abundant internal evidence of the opposite characteristics ascribed to him. There is, indeed, much reason to believe that the Ionic, both of Herodotus and of Hippocrates, the only other contemporaneous writer whose works have survived, also a Dorian, and equally free from local obligation to uniformity, is a more or less artificial compound of the materials which those four varieties of Ionian speech placed at their disposal, with a tendency to exaggerate the dialectical peculiarities by which the four in common were distinguished.

Nor is this anomaly of usage confined to the text of different authors. The same author often varies no less widely in himself; employing the same word in different forms, according as it may suit the variations of his own sense of propriety or euphony. This forms another feature of distinction between the practice of the Greek and that of the polite modern languages. In the latter, all such license of duplicate forms is limited to poetical style; and is even there, in more refined periods of literature, but sparingly employed. The English poet may still write o'er for over, or e'en for even, &c., where the use of the same contracted terms would be absurd or

[1] Hermogen. de Form. Orat. II. p. 402., ed. 1569.

affected in a prose author. But the great masters of Ionian prose style, in numerous cases, avail themselves at discretion of similar duplicate forms; and even in the more settled Attic dialect they are not altogether excluded.[1]

Attic prose.

15. The principal characteristic of the Ionian prose dialect, as exemplified in its two preserved standards above cited, and by which it is mainly distinguished from the classical Attic to which it gave place, is its partiality for vowel sounds, especially the vowel E. The modes in which this characteristic chiefly displays itself are: the employment, in uncontracted form, of groups of contiguous vowels, which in other dialects are contracted; the solution into simple vowels, of syllables pronounced as diphthongs in the common dialect; the insertion of vowels, and prolongation by that means of simple vowels into diphthongs; the occasional substitution of vowels for consonants; to which may be added a preference of mute or liquid consonants to aspirates or gutturals. These peculiarities, many of them derived from, or modelled after, the Homeric usage, all tend to impart, both to sound and structure, a certain softness and tenuity, not favourable to the effective treatment of the more practical orders of literary subjects. The substitution, therefore, of the Attic of Thucydides for the Ionic of Herodotus as the classical dialect of prose, was an important step in the progress of the Greek tongue to the perfection which it attained, as a vehicle of varied and accurate thought, during the latter part of the Attic period.

We have already had frequent occasion to notice the want of inventive precocity, which forms a cha-

[1] See Appendix B.

racteristic of the genius of Athens; her slowness to originate new forms of literature, as contrasted with her power of maturing and perfecting those introduced from abroad. We have seen that all the higher orders of prose composition originate with natives of other Greek states; and the same will now be shown to be the case even with the classical Attic prose style. The political ascendancy of Athens; her superiority in fine art, and in the more popular branches of poetry; with the attractions which she held out to foreign men of genius of every class, who flocked to her as the common centre of elegant pursuit; all contributed, during this period, to render her, as she has been called [1], the School of Greece. But in so far at least as the art of prose composition is concerned, it is certain that, during the Periclean age, the school of Athens was that in which the Athenians themselves were taught, rather than that in which they instructed others.

The term Substitution has above been preferred to that of Transition, to express the ascendancy acquired by the Attic over the Ionic dialect as the language of Greek classical prose. There can be no doubt that the classical Attic is a modification of the Ionic; but the Ionic so modified was not that of Herodotus and his fellow-logographers; the tendency of which, as we have just seen, was in no degree towards Attic conciseness. The mother dialect of the Attic is to be sought in a simpler and purer form of the same Ionic; in the text, namely of Archilochus, and the contemporaneous Ionian poets; whose works date more than a century prior to the rise of popular prose composition, and little short of three centuries

[1] Thucyd. II. 41.

prior to the publication of the history of Herodotus. Their language, while the purest Ionic, offers more points of conformity to the Attic of Thucydides than to the Ionic of Herodotus. It represents the original source whence both are derived; the former by a systematic course of contraction, the latter by an opposite process of liquidation. The dialect of Archilochus and the elder Simonides may also be considered as representing the spoken language of the Ionian race of that period, including the population of Attica. It is true that the dialect of poetry can seldom, especially in Greece, be taken as a just representative of that of real life. The present case, however, is one of the few exceptions to the general rule. The special province of the Iambic school of poetry, of which Archilochus and Simonides were the chiefs, was to reflect existing social habits. The Iambic measure hence became proverbial as that which embodied, in the most effective manner, the sound and expression of colloquial intercourse; and owed its invention, in the theory of the classical grammarians, to its peculiar adaptation to that purpose.[1] There can be as little doubt, therefore, that the language in which Archilochus satirises his contemporaries is the vernacular Ionic of his day, as that the language of Aristophanes is the spoken Attic of the age of Pericles.

But the Iambic dialect of Archilochus is identical, in all essential respects, with that of Æschylus and Sophocles. While offering, no doubt, a smaller number of contracted forms than the Attic of those authors, it shows a greater partiality for those forms than for the expansiveness of Herodotus. The dialect of the tragic dialogue is in fact that of Archi-

[1] See Vol. III. p. 24. sq.

lochus in a certain stage of advancement towards the precision which was ultimately imparted to it by the Attic orators and historians.

Of the circumstances under which this further modification took place we are, as already remarked, the less able to judge, owing to the want of native Athenian prose authors during the first century of prose literature. It may, however, safely be assumed, that the spoken language of Athens from the time of Solon downwards, that in which Pisistratus, Themistocles, and Pericles successively swayed the destinies of the republic, would, even without any special benefit of literary culture, gradually assume in their brilliant harangues that nervous vigour which it displays in the written compositions of their successors. This effect was produced, in so far as regards dialect, by a further retrenchment of those redundant vocal elements inherited from their Ionian ancestors, and still partially retained in the drama. Such is the form in which prose composition appears in the earliest extant productions of a native Attic author, the orations of Antiphon; who may thus in so far rank as the father of native Attic prose. Antiphon was, however, junior to those Sicilian rhetors, Corax, Tisias, and Gorgias, whom the Athenians themselves acknowledged as the first establishers of the classical prose style. By their instructions, whether delivered in their native island, or during their professional visits to other parts of continental or colonial Greece, it is certain that the Athenian pleaders, and among them probably Antiphon himself, had profited, before Athens could boast a native school of rhetoric. But the language in which their lessons were conveyed to their Attic pupils, or in which their specimen

orations destined for an Attic audience were composed, was assuredly neither the Doric of Syracuse, nor the Ionic hitherto common to the writers of the old logographic school. There can be no doubt, even in the absence of any specific evidence on the subject, that those Sicilian masters, in entering on the wider field of intellectual enterprise which they had opened up for themselves, had the tact to perceive that the more effective mode of securing popularity in the central seat of Greek civilisation, was to adopt and cultivate its native speech, to the full value of which, beyond the popular departments of poetry, the gifted race by whom it was spoken had hitherto been blind. The more distinguished among the native authors who immediately followed or emulated them in the written cultivation of Attic prose were: Antiphon, already mentioned; Andocides; Lysias, pupil of the Syracusan Tisias; and Thucydides, the reputed disciple of both Gorgias and Antiphon.

Style as dependent on composition.

16. Hitherto our attention has been directed to the history of classical Greek style mainly as dependent on dialect. We now proceed to consider its vicissitudes of structure and composition. These vicissitudes, to be rightly understood, must be taken in connexion with the parallel stages in the progress of the human intellect of which literature is the representative. Prose originates in the desire which springs up, with the advance of elementary culture, for some more practical mode of recording facts or expressing opinions than those poetical forms which, in primitive times, are the first to suggest themselves. The subjects for treatment at this earliest stage of the new order of composition being limited, the mode of treating them naturally partakes of the same cha-

racter; and the earlier specimens of prose are accordingly dry and meagre, both in style and in matter. As the range of ideas to be expressed becomes wider and more diversified, the mode of expressing them participates in the same enlargement; and style becomes more free, flowing, and elegant. It were to be desired that, in this more forward stage of its progress to maturity, style should follow the same natural course observed at the commencement; experience however shows that the reverse invariably happens. When composition becomes an art, the newborn zeal of its early professors leads them, in theorising on its principles, to prefer exaggerated or affected forms in their efforts to reduce those principles to practice. And this crisis in the history of literary style as invariably coincides with a similar crisis in the state of intellectual culture at large; artifice and subtlety of expression being accompanied by a proportional amount of artifice and subtlety in doctrine and sentiment. As critical judgement becomes still further matured, these defects in each case are corrected. A sounder state of knowledge selects more rational forms of argument and expression; the principles of technical rhetoric are better applied; the pomp and glitter of artificial phraseology, which dazzled the taste of the youthful public, are condemned and discarded; and the art of composition, thus purified and chastened, reaches its perfection. That perfection, however, as in all other creations of human intellect, is but of temporary duration; and style, keeping pace as before with the parallel course of social vicissitude, relapses, with the decline of national character, into feebleness and affectation.

The above speculative views find abundance of apt illustration in the history both of modern and antient society. The quaint simplicity of the primitive Ionian logographer, to be exemplified in the sequel, stands in the plainest analogy to that of the monkish chronicler of the modern middle ages. The meretricious graces and subtle logic of the Sicilian sophist have their counterpart in the scholastic rhetoric of the more advanced stages of medieval literature.[1] In the polite modern languages we find a golden age, similar to that of Plato and Demosthenes, shaking off the trammels of scholastic artifice; and, in the subsequent vicissitudes of modern style, an impartial posterity will recognise, there can be little doubt, those ingredients of iron, brass, or lead, which the classical scholar readily discerns in the lower Greek writers, but which a contemporary public is less willing or competent to detect in its native literature.

Sententious style.

It will now be proper to illustrate the above general sketch of the vicissitudes of prose composition by a reference to individual authors. Here, again, we have to regret the loss, with the exception

[1] This common feature in the history of antient and modern learning seems really to involve much of the sum and substance of the great controversy which has agitated the world of letters ever since the days of Socrates, concerning the merits or defects of the Greek "sophists." The sophistical tendency of early Greek prose literature was as natural a condition of the progress of learning and civilisation in antient times, as the scholastic tendency of the literature of the modern middle ages was a consequence of the state of society and knowledge which then prevailed. Socrates in the one period, and Bacon in the other, were the literary reformers who first endeavoured to introduce sounder views and better methods. The main difference between the two cases seems to consist in the greater bitterness of the controversial spirit with which the sophists were attacked by the Socratic philosophers, than the modern scholastic masters by their opponents; and which, coupled with the almost entire loss of the original works of the sophists, has led them to be as hastily and unfairly treated by posterity as by their own contemporaries.

of a few fragments, of the works of those Ionian writers, in whose pages the earlier characteristics of national style were exhibited. Those characteristics have, however, been described with great distinctness by some of the best antient critics, and illustrated by apposite extracts from the original texts. We shall here distinguish the manner of the primitive Milesian or Ionic school as the Sententious style; that of the Siculo-Attic or Rhetorical school as the Periodic style. The authors of the former class are elegantly described by Cicero[1], in the very appropriate parallel which he draws between them and the Catos and Fabius Pictors of the corresponding age of Roman literature, as careless of those expedients which tend to embellish language, and aiming at little more than to make themselves understood at the smallest expense of words Aristotle designates their ordinary structure by the epithet of "jointed."[2] This term he explains as denoting the inartificial way in which their sentences are linked or strung together; so as, while little connected with each other, to offer no definite period or resting-place until the close of the entire subject in hand. Another critic, by a curious contradiction of terms, but with an obvious parity of meaning, calls the same mode of structure "disjointed"[3]; which term he defines as indicating a text consisting of short and loosely connected clauses or members. A further peculiarity of the early Ionian historians, also noticed by the antient critics, was a partiality for the old metrical forms of the epic poets, of whose works their own were often little more than prose

[1] De Orat. II. xii.: conf. Dion. Hal. de Thucyd. Jud. 23.
[2] εἰρομένη, Aristot. Rhet. III. 9.
[3] διῳρημένη, Demetr. de Eloc. 12.

paraphrases.[1] Among the more characteristic passages of their text that have survived, several are composed almost entirely of such poetical phraseology.

As an example of the sententious mode of structure, Aristotle[2] cites the opening paragraph of Herodotus. Demetrius[3] also specifies the style of Herodotus, with what justice will be seen in the sequel, as belonging "for the most part" to the sententious order, but borrows his illustration from the introductory passage of the history of Hecatæus, which is here subjoined, and is certainly more to the point than the example selected by Aristotle:

Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω ὡς μοι ἀληθέα δοκέει εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοί τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσίν.

Thus saith Hecatæus the Milesian: The things which I write are such as I believe to be true. For the legends of the Greeks are many, and, as appears to me, also ridiculous.

Other, perhaps better, examples will be adduced in the chapter devoted to the lives and works of this class of authors.[4]

[1] Strabo, I. p. 18. [2] Loc. cit. [3] Loc. cit.

[4] This style, condemned as dry and lifeless by the standard antient critics, is highly popular in our own literature of the present day; owing partly to an exaggerated straining after perspicuity, which, ever since the publication of Cobbet's Grammar, has formed the principal test of correct English composition, partly to the popularity of the authors by whom it is sanctioned. Macaulay's writings abound in examples of the "jointed" style, which would perhaps have shocked Aristotle almost as much as the quaint sententiousness of Hecatæus. And even the impartial modern critic must be sensible, that the vigorous terseness and unvarying clearness which mark the English of that brilliant writer, scarcely make amends for the incoherence of structure at the cost of which those advantages are often attained. The disjointed Greek style is also noted, it can hardly be said commended, by antient critics for its perspicuity. (Dion. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 23.)

17. In the periodic style which succeeded, the subordinate clauses of the text were grouped into more comprehensive periods or paragraphs, of just length and proportions, offering what the same Aristotle[1] defines as a beginning and an end; and coming home to the reader's apprehension as a single animated body, instead of being scattered before him in separate parts or limbs. This style originated with the Sicilian rhetoricians, and was eagerly adopted and cultivated by their admirers and disciples among the Athenian orators.[2] The merits, however, of these masters, especially of Gorgias, the most popular among them, in imparting dignity and symmetry to the structure of phrases, were counterbalanced by the vicious excess to which, with the zeal of early reformers, they carried those artifices of sentiment and diction[3] admitted, even by the most fastidious critics, to be, when used in moderation, essential to the higher excellence of literary composition. Periodic style. Gorgias.

To the school of Gorgias the antient grammarians oppose that of Lysias[4] his younger contemporary, an Athenian by birth but a Sicilian by parentage, and educated at Thurium in Italy. His language was as remarkable for artlessness and ease, as that of his predecessor for bold and brilliant artifice. His style has accordingly been characterised as an improvement on that of the old Ionian sententious school, retaining much of its homely simplicity of materials, but moulding them into more elegant combinations. Lysias.

[1] Rhet. III. 9. sq.; Demetrius, 12. sq.

[2] Quintil. Inst. Or. III. 1.; Diodor. XII. 53.; Cicer. Orat. XII. 39., XIII. 40., LII. 175.; Gräfenh. Gesch. der Philol. I. p. 131.

[3] Dion. Hal. J. de Thucyd. 24.; De adm. vi Demosth. 4.; Timæus, ap. Dionys. Jud. de Lys. 3.; Diod. Sic. XII. 53.; Aristot. Rhet. III. 1.; Cic. locc. sup. citt.: conf. Westermann, Gesch. der Beredsamkeit, § 31.

[4] Dion. Hal. de adm. vi Demosth. 2. 4., Jud. de Lys.

Perfection of Attic style.

The next and noblest form of the classical Attic style was that in which it appears, variously modified, in the pages of Plato and Demosthenes. This style has been characterised, by a phrase habitually employed by the antients to denote the most excellent vein of composition in prose or in verse, as the middle or medium style; that, namely, which preserved a just equilibrium between the extremes of simplicity and subtlety, between turgid pomp and sententious dryness. It has been further described as a combination of the preceding styles of Gorgias and Lysias. Its cultivators, among whom the first place is assigned to Thrasymachus of Chalcedon[1], while repudiating the studied conceits of the Sicilian rhetor, did not disdain to turn his artistic expedients to profitable account in seasoning the simplicity of his Attic successor.

Later vicissitudes of Ionic style.

While Attic style was passing through these vicissitudes, the sister Ionic dialect, which, as we have seen, had reached a certain state of maturity before the rival destined to supplant her could yet be said to exist, had not been exempt from change. The classical grammarians indeed, by whom the manner of the early Ionian authors is characterised in the mass as of the dry sententious order, say little or nothing of any improvement having subsequently taken place, or of any adaptation of Ionic forms to the new more fluent style of composition. No exception to the rule laid down in the case of Acusilaus and Hecatæus is made in favour of Hellanicus or Pherecydes; and

[1] Theophrast. ap. Dion. Hal. de admir. vi Demosth. 3.; Plat. Phædr. p. 266.; Suid. v. Θρασύμ. Cicero, on the other hand, appears to class the style of Thrasymachus with that of Gorgias. De Orat. XII. 39., XIII. 40.: conf. Quintil. III. 1.

even Herodotus appears to be subjected to the same stigma. But on this point fortunately the possession of his great work enables us to form our own opinion, and to pronounce, that as a model of that combination of copiousness and conciseness, of simplicity and elegance, of artifice and ease, which constitutes the best and purest narrative style, Herodotus may rank at least on a par with the greatest Attic masters of the best period. The fragments of the Lerian Pherecydes, of Hellanicus, and some others of the more popular Ionian writers of the latter half of the fifth century B. C., also exhibit more of the Attic fluency than of the disjointed meagreness of the primitive Ionian manner.

A defect of the classical Attic style.

Any more detailed commentary on the vicissitudes of Greek prose style, must be reserved for our remarks on the works of those authors in whose pages they are chiefly exemplified. There is, however, one characteristic peculiarity of Attic prose at every stage of its history, a distinct apprehension of which is essential to a right estimate both of its own genius, and of that of Greek literature: the extent to which it was founded on the principles, and adapted to the forms, of public oratory. In this respect Attic composition differs as well from that of the polite nations of modern Europe, as from that of the Ionian Greeks, with whom prose literature originated in, and was guided by, the forms of written narrative rather than of oral declamation. During the flourishing age of Athens and of republican Greece, the more important business of life was carried on chiefly in the mode of public discussion. The acquirement, therefore, of a vigorous and persuasive style of oratory was an object paramount to all others connected with literary

pursuit. This was more especially the case in Athens, amid the absence of indigenous taste or talent for narrative composition in that state before the time of Thucydides. The study of the art of composition came accordingly to be directed mainly to its advantage and use in forensic debate.

Under these circumstances it was natural that the influence of this engrossing branch of polite literature should be extensively felt in every other; that the lecture of the philosopher, the narrative of the historian, and the disquisition of the popular essayist should be more or less impregnated with rhetorical ingredients. Hence the practice universal among the early sophists, and partially maintained after their time, of embodying treatises on every kind of subject in the form of orations. Hence the preference by the popular schools of philosophy for the dialectic mode of inculcating their doctrines. Hence the accumulation of speeches in the text of the historian. Hence too may be explained and palliated that involution of language, and those long-drawn and complicated periods, which, in the page of the best Greek authors, so often puzzle the modern student, and excite his surprise that the same difficulties should not have given greater offence to the delicate taste of an Athenian public. It is probable, however, that the embarrassment which we here experience was but little felt by the more subtle intellect of the Attic reader. Trained from his youth to follow with intense interest the discussions of the senate or law court, through the mazes of acute argument or animated peroration, elucidated and enforced by all the aids of voice, countenance, and gesture, which an accomplished Attic orator had at command, he transferred the habit

thus acquired, of alternately concentrating and subdividing his attention, from his forensic attendance to his chamber studies; and found as little difficulty in apprehending an elaborately prolonged period when brought under the one sense in a written form, as when conveyed to the other from the lips of the orator. Hence, in every subsequent stage of classical literature (for the habit of the Romans in this respect, partly from similarity of manners, partly from deference to their Attic masters, is akin to that of the Greeks), the term Literary composition, in the vocabulary of criticism, is nearly synonymous with that of Rhetoric; the standard works on this varied subject are entitled treatises on rhetoric or oratory; and the standard models of style held up to the imitation of the student are the works of the popular orators, rather than those of the historians or essayists.

With every allowance for the peculiar genius of the age in which the masterpieces of Attic prose were produced, a consideration which must always have a certain weight in literary judgements, still, the impartial modern critic cannot but discern, in this pervading rhetorical tone, a defect, perhaps the only serious defect, in the classical Greek style. The essence of all art is the imitation of nature; and the forms which nature supplies, while they may be idealised or embellished, can never without a sacrifice of genuine excellence in art's productions be entirely effaced. But it is certainly not natural for the historian or the popular essayist, to address his readers in the same tone in which the defender of a client, or the denouncer of a political opponent, addresses a public assembly. Nor is it natural that the characters who figure in a historical narrative

should be introduced haranguing each other in elaborate speeches, composed by the author and placed in their mouths for the occasion. Such speeches, even where they represent with any fidelity the sentiments of those to whom they are ascribed, must be purely imaginary in form, and in most cases are, it is certain, no less imaginary in substance. But a historical work is, in its nature and essence, the reverse of a work of imagination. Truth and reality, in the fullest extent to which they can be investigated, ought to be the inflexible guides of the historian's course; and it is as plain an infringement of this fundamental law of his art, to attribute to men words which they never spoke, as actions which they never performed.

# CHAP. III.

## HISTORIANS PRIOR TO HERODOTUS.

### PART I. HISTORIANS FLOURISHING PRIOR TO THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR.

1. EARLY FABULOUS OR APOCRYPHAL WRITERS. ACUSILAUS. HIS GENEALOGICAL WORK. HIS VERSION OF THE LEGEND OF TROY. — 2. SCYLAX OF CARYANDA. HECATÆUS OF MILETUS. HIS AGE, AND CHARACTER. — 3. HIS PERIODUS OR DESCRIPTION OF THE EARTH. — 4. ARRANGEMENT OF ITS CONTENTS. — 5. COUNTRIES OMITTED OR NEGLECTED. OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF HIS GEOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH. — 6. HIS GENEALOGICAL WORK. HIS DIALECT AND STYLE. DIONYSIUS OF MILETUS. — 7. CHARON OF LAMPSACUS. HIS AGE AND WORKS. MATERIALS SUPPLIED BY THEM TO HERODOTUS. HIS STYLE. — 8. XANTHUS OF LYDIA. HIS LYDIAN HISTORY. OTHER REPUTED WORKS. — 9. HIPPYS OF RHEGIUM. HIS WORKS. HIS STYLE. DEÏOCHUS OF PROCONNESUS. MELESAGORAS. EUDEMUS OF PAROS. DEMOCLES OF PHYGELA. SIMONIDES OF CEOS. XENOMEDES OF CHIOS.

### PART II. HISTORIANS FLOURISHING DURING THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR.

10. PHERECYDES. HIS AGE AND BIRTHPLACE. HIS ARCHÆOLOGIA. — 11. HIS SYSTEM OF MYTHOLOGY. HIS STYLE. — 12. ANTIOCHUS OF SYRACUSE. HIS NOTICE OF ROME. — 13. STESIMBROTUS OF THASOS. HIS MEMOIRS OF ATHENIAN STATESMEN. HIS CHARACTER OF CIMON, AND OF PERICLES. — 14. ION OF CHIOS. HIS PROSE WORKS. HIS CHARACTER OF PERICLES, AND OF CIMON. — 15. HIS STYLE. — 16. HERODORUS OF HERACLEA. HIS LIFE OF HERCULES. HIS ARGONAUTICA. HIS COMPOSITION AND STYLE. HIS OTHER WORKS. — 17. HELLANICUS OF LESBOS. HIS AGE. LIST OF HIS WORKS. — 18. HIS DEUCALIONIA: PHORONIS: ATLANTIS. — 19. HIS ATTHIS: ÆOLICA: LESBICA: TROÏCA: PERSICA: ARGIVE PRIESTESSES: CARNEONICÆ. — 20. APOCRYPHAL WORKS. HIS KNOWLEDGE OF THE LATIN TONGUE. HIS STYLE. DAMASTES OF SIGEUM.

1. FOLLOWING the method of a popular antient critic, we shall, in the present chapter, treat of the authors who form its subject under the two heads: of Historians flourishing before the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, in 431 B.C.; and Historians flourishing

during that contest, 431—404 B.C. As the works ascribed to these writers have in no instance been transmitted entire, and as the general characteristics by which they are distinguished have engaged our attention in the previous pages, a proportionally limited space will be required for their special history or that of their authors.

Early fabulous and apocryphal authors.

It has been remarked in previous portions of this work[1], that several of the poets who flourished during the latter part of the Poetical period obtained credit with the popular Greek public for the composition of prose histories in addition to their metrical productions. We have, however, also seen that the genuine character of these histories is more than doubtful. As the long passage quoted by Pausanias from the "Corinthian history" of Eumelus is identical in substance with a fragment of the metrical Corinthiaca of the same author, there is the more reason to believe the history to have been but a prose paraphrase of the poem by some bookmaker of a later period.[2] The notices of prose compositions by Aristeas or Epimenides are scarcely sufficient to establish that such works, whether genuine or forged, ever were current under the names of those authors.[3] Concerning Cadmus of Miletus, little need be added to what has been said in the last chapter. Even admitting his real personality, it was not pretended that any of his writings had survived his own age.

[1] Supra, Ch. ii. § 2.: conf. Vol. II. p. 450. 469. 473.

[2] Vol. II. p. 450. Eumelus is further stated by Clemens of Alexandria (Strom. vi. p. 629. a.) to have paraphrased Hesiod in prose. The work here alluded to was probably the same mentioned by Pausanias (iv. iv. 1.), which Clemens may have described in those terms, owing to some correspondence observable between the Corinthian mythology of Eumelus and that of Hesiod.

[3] Supra, p. 58. seq.

## ACUSILAUS,[1]

Acusilaus of Argos.

who shares with Cadmus the honours of inventor of prose history, has himself at least an undisputed claim to a historical existence. Nor can the stigma of illegitimacy which Suidas has affixed[2] to the work ascribed to him in the Byzantine age, affect the genuine character of that which passed current under the same name in classical times, quoted as it has been without objection or suspicion by so many better authorities from the time of Plato downwards.[3]

The principal extant notices of Acusilaus have been transmitted by Suidas.[4] He is said by that compiler, as by other authorities, to have been born at Argos; which Argos, however, is described by the same Suidas as situated in the neighbourhood of Aulis. Modern commentators[5] would explain this apparent contradiction by assuming Acusilaus to have been a native, not of the celebrated Peloponnesian Argos, but of a locality of that name mentioned by geographers on the coast of Bœotia, opposite Aulis of Eubœa. An argument of his Bœotian origin might perhaps be drawn from the circumstance of his having given a marked preference to Hesiod among the earlier authorities on the subjects which he treated. To this may be added, that, judging from the extant citations of his text, a large share of his

[1] The remains of this author, and of the others who form the subject of the present chapter, are every where cited from Didot's, or rather C. Müller's (apud Didot), valuable collection of Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum; unless where some other compilation is specified.

[2] v. Ἑκαταῖος.

[3] Frg. 1. See also Apollodorus, Strabo, Didymus, Josephus, in frgg. 6. 11a. 12. 15. 17. sqq. 28.

[4] v. Ἀκουσίλ.: conf. Diog. Laert. I. § 41.

[5] Ap. Didot, Frgg. Acus. p. xxxvi.

attention was bestowed on heroes or places belonging to one or other shore of the Straits of Euripus. It is true, however, that an equally large portion of those citations relate to the affairs of the Peloponnesian Argos. Nor is it easy to reconcile with his Bœotian nativity the familiar manner in which he is entitled Acusilaus "the Argive," or "of Argos," by Strabo, Josephus, and other classics, who would hardly have applied that noble gentilic without some qualification to the native of an obscure Bœotian village.

Of his age, no more precise notice has been transmitted than that he flourished during the sixth century B.C., contemporaneously with Pherecydes [1], who, in his own department of philosophy, competes with him for the palm of priority in the cultivation of prose literature.

His genealogical work.

The same Suidas already quoted calls the father of Acusilaus Cabas; and describes the son as having compiled his "Genealogies," the only work attributed to him, from tablets of brass found by the father while making an excavation on his ground. Of whatever materials the compilation may have been formed, it seems to have been confined to purely fabulous matter. This may be inferred, both from the notices of commentators, and from the absence of allusion, in the fragments of the text, to any event dating subsequently to the Dorian conquest. The only exception, if such it can be called, is a passage in which mention occurs of the Homeridæ of Chios.

These Genealogies are described by one respectable

[1] Joseph. contr. Ap. I.; Clem. Alex. Strom. I. p. 299., who mentions, as does Suidas, the claim of Acusilaus to a place among the Seven sages: conf. Dion. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 5.

authority as a prose paraphrase of those of Hesiod while another states Acusilaus to have corrected many particulars the traditions of the Bœotian minstrel.[1] Both notices are confirmed by the internal evidence of the fragments. While adopting Hesiod generally as his text-book, Acusilaus seems to have freely rejected the authority of that poet, where the versions of the same tradition derived from other sources appeared preferable.[2] His case, therefore, illustrates the description formerly given of the character of these early prose histories, as embodying the materials transmitted by the old genealogical poets in a more methodical form, with remarks on the conflicting versions of the same story, and reasons in support of that preferred by the logographer.[3]

The fragments of Acusilaus, though less numerous than those of some other popular authors of the same class, suffice to afford a fair general notion of the plan of his work. It embraced both the divine genealogy, as given in the Hesiodic Theogony, and the human lines of succession, extending, in the Catalogues and other works of the Bœotian poet, down to the epoch of the Dorian irruption, which forms the limit of the Greek heroic age. With Acusilaus as with Hesiod,

[1] Clem. Alex. Str. VI. p. 629. A.; Joseph. contr. Ap. I. 3.

[2] The numerous points of correspondence between the two mythologers, referred to by the authors who cite Acusilaus, need not here be recapitulated. The chief points of difference are in their genealogies of Pelasgus, Deucalion, and Scylla, and in their accounts of the daughters of Prœtus. Frgg. 5. 7. 12. 19.

[3] Of the style and method of the Argive author's critical commentary we have a specimen in his limitation (frg. 3.) of the principal winds in the system of Hesiod to three, Boreas, Zephyrus, and Notus; the title Argestes (Theog. 379.), which some interpreters of the Bœotian poet ranked as the name of a fourth wind, being pronounced but an epithet of Zephyrus.

the primary element of nature was Chaos; whence emerged Earth, Night, Æther, and Eros (Love). Then followed in each author the Titans and Titanesses, Ocean and Tethys, Acheloüs and the Rivers, the Winds, the Cabiri, and other inferior personifications of nature. From the affairs of Heaven the series was carried, in the same Hesiodic order, to those of Earth, beginning with Hellas or Thessaly; through Prometheus, Deucalion, Pyrrha, and the Æolidæ; Aëthlius, Calyce, and Endymion; Coronis and Ischys; Phrixus and the Golden Fleece.

The notices of central Greece commenced[1] with the rape of Europa, as introductory to the Cadmean dynasty of Bœotia. The death of Actæon was attributed, after Stesichorus, to the wrath of Jupiter, whom the hero had presumed to rival in the affections of Semele. Allusion was also made to the fate of Narcissus, described as a Eubœan of Eretria, son of Amaranthus, the eponyme hero of a Eubœan town.[2]

To the Attic series belong the account of Ogyges the autochthon king, and his flood; of Erechtheus and his daughter Orithyia; of her rape by Boreas; and of the twin Argonauts, Zetes and Calaïs, whom she bore to that deity.[3]

Acusilaus next treated of his native Argolis; of Pelasgus; of Inachus, his daughter Io, and his son Phoroneus, the first of Argive mortal men; of Argus and his hundred eyes; of Prœtus and his incontinent daughters.[4] The work seems to have concluded, following up the same Argive line of mythology, with the heroes of the Iliad and Odyssey; the royal races

[1] Frgg. 1. 10, 11a. 25. 29.
[2] Frgg. 20—22.
[3] Frgg. 14. 23. sq.
[4] Frgg. 12—19.

of Troy, Lacedæmon, and Ithaca; the Mysian Heraclidæ, Telephus and Eurypylus.[1] The Phæacians were made, after Alcæus, offspring of the blood-drops from the mutilated body of Uranus, instead of sons of Posidon, as with Homer. This passage[2] is quoted from the author's "third book." As it probably occurred in his notice of the voyage of Ulysses, and by consequence towards the close of the work, the entire series of genealogies may be presumed to have formed three books: the first devoted to Thessaly; the second to central Greece, Bœotia, Attica, and the neighbouring states; the third to Peloponnesus, and the leading heroes who fought for or against the Atridæ before Troy. The notice of the Homeridæ of Chios also occurred in the third book; suggested, no doubt, by the Homeric character of its subject.

His version of the legend of Troy.

The most curious remnant of the mythology of Acusilaus that has been preserved is his account of the origin of the Trojan war.[3] According to him that great series of events was caused by the ambition of Venus. An old oracle had pronounced that the line of Priam should be one day supplanted on the royal throne of Ilium by the descendants of Anchises. Venus, desirous of becoming ancestress of a race for whom this high honour was reserved, formed an amorous connexion with Anchises, and became the mother of Æneas. In order to secure the speedy fulfilment of the oracle, she inspires Paris and Helen with mutual love; the result of which was the abduction of the heroine and the invasion of the Troad. The favour which Homer represents the goddess as manifesting towards the Trojans during the siege was explained as an insidious artifice, resorted to for

[1] Frgg. 26—31. [2] Frg. 29. [3] Frg. 26.

the purpose of more surely promoting the destruction of the Priamidæ, and the advancement of her son to the chieftainship of the Dardanian race. This new, and apparently in great part original, version of the Troïc legend, is founded on the tradition of Homer and of the Homeric hymn to Venus, regarding the future lot of Æneas. It also agrees with the Cyprian poem in describing Venus as the principal agent in the Trojan cycle of events[1], but differs as to the mode in which her influence was exercised. The advantage is certainly on the side of the Argive logographer; whose system, if less in unison with the genuine heroic tradition, surpasses that of the Cyclic poem in ingenuity and elegance. It affords, consequently, a favourable impression of the taste of Acusilaus in the management of his mythological materials.

In the collection of this author's remains there is but one text which can be considered as a fragment in the stricter sense, or verbal extract from his text. The dialect of this passage presents, as modified probably by later transcribers, purely Attic forms. But the language in other respects exemplifies, in a striking manner, the primitive Ionian prose style, both in the disjointed arrangement of the clauses, and in the poetical or even metrical turn of the expression. On this account, and as the earliest extant specimen of Greek classical prose, it possesses, brief as it is, sufficient interest to deserve a place in our text:[2]

*Ὠκεανὸς δὲ γαμεῖ Τηθὺν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφήν. Τῶν δὲ γίγνονται τρισχίλιοι ποταμοί. Ἀχελῷος δὲ αὐτῶν πρεσβύτατος, καὶ τετιμηται μάλιστα.*

[1] See Vol. II. p. 279. sqq.

[2] Frg. 11.

Ocean espouses his own sister Tethys. Three thousand rivers were their offspring. Of these the eldest and most honoured was Acheloüs.

The text seems to be made up in great part of fragments of dactylic metre.

## SCYLAX.

Scylax of Caryanda

2. The earliest Greek author of a prose work deserving the name of historical in the better sense is the geographer Scylax of Caryanda, a town of the Halicarnassian territory; who may also rank as one of the most adventurous of Greek navigators. Acting under the orders of Darius Hystaspes (521—485 B.C.) he explored the river Indus from the upper part of its course to its mouth; whence he sailed westward along the coasts of the Southern Ocean to the Red Sea.[1] Of this expedition he left an account in writing, cited by Aristotle[2] relative to the forms of monarchal government among the Indians. As one spurious treatise which still survives, and probably others now lost, were current under the name of this author in later times, it is not easy to distinguish the genuine from the supposititious in the few extant citations of "Scylax"[3] chiefly by writers of a low period. But if these citations represent his own statements, he must have been either a very mendacious or a very credulous traveller. Several of them contain descriptions of marvels or monsters of the most extravagant kind. Among these may be mentioned the Sciapodæ, or shade-footed men, whose feet were so broad that when resting from their

[1] Herodot. IV. 44.
[2] Polit. VII. 13.: conf. Strab. XIV. p. 566. 658.
[3] Ap. Klausen, Scyl. Peripl. p. 254.

labour, they spread them over their heads to protect them from the sunbeams; and the Otolicnian, or umbrella-eared men, whose ears were so large as to serve for the same purpose.[1]

Although Caryanda, the birthplace of Scylax, was a Dorian town, it is probable that, following the fashion of his time, he composed in the Ionic dialect. But the citations of his work shed no light on the subject.

## HECATÆUS.[2]

Hecatæus of Miletus.

The notices which we possess of the personal history of this author are the more valuable, from having been transmitted, in great part, from testimony almost contemporaneous, and in itself of a strictly authentic nature. For Hecatæus is the only previous writer in his own branch of composition whom Herodotus cites by name; and that in terms indicating his high respect for the character of his predecessor, both as an author and as a man. That Herodotus should have referred to Hecatæus in his literary capacity chiefly for the purpose of controverting him, may be considered as even a higher tribute to the value of his authority than a corresponding amount of acquiescence in his views; while the ungracious mode in which some of the rival opinions are dismissed, is compensated by the handsome testimony borne to the personal merits of him by whom they were entertained, in other parts of the work of the same Herodotus.

[1] Klausen, p. 257.

[2] Creuzer, Frgg. Histt. Gr. antiquiss. 1806; Klausen, Frgg. Hecatæi; Müller, Frgg. Hecatæi, in Didot's Collection, vol. 1. The fragments are cited according to Müller, unless where the contrary is stated.

His age

Hecatæus, son of Hegesander of Miletus, is stated by Suidas[1] to have flourished from about the 65th Ol. (520 B.C.) down to the close of the Persian war (479 B.C.), or a few years beyond the latter epoch; which notice is in harmony with those supplied by Herodotus, and with the evidence of his own remains. Allowing him thirty-five years at the former date, taken as his acme or flourishing era, he would have been past seventy at the time of his death.

and character.

The prominent part taken by Hecatæus in the politics of his native country, would imply that he was of noble Milesian birth. This may also be inferred from the complacency, ridiculed by Herodotus[2], with which, when in Egypt, he is said to have traced back his pedigree, through Danaus or Cecrops it may be presumed, to one of the deities of that country. That he was an enterprising traveller appears, as well from the variety of regions which he described, the functions of traveller and geographer being in those days more or less identical, as from the title of "far-travelled man[3]," with which he is honoured by his commentators. There can therefore be little doubt of his having visited the more accessible localities described in his great geographical work. The extant notices of his actual residence in foreign lands, or of the nature and value of his observations as a traveller, relate solely to Egypt, which country he seems to have carefully examined.

The account given by Herodotus of the political conduct of Hecatæus exhibits him as a sagacious councillor, an honest patriot, and a man of the world, remarkable beyond the spirit of his age for his freedom from the trammels of the prevailing superstition,

[1] vv. Ἑκαταῖος, Ἑλλάνικος. [2] II. 143. [3] Agathem, I. 1.

where tending to interfere with useful objects. In the 70th Ol. (499 B.C.), Aristagoras, a leading citizen of Miletus, organised a conspiracy of the Asiatic Greeks, for the emancipation of their common country from the Persian yoke. In the council of Ionian notables, convened by Aristagoras to concert measures for their proposed outbreak, Hecatæus alone[1], among those present, discountenanced the project, on the very simple ground of the overwhelming power of the Persian empire, and the hopelessness of any effort, by a few small states at one of its extremities, to assert their independence against its boundless resources. This argument he enforced by recapitulating the number and magnitude of the nations over which Darius ruled. His remonstrances proving fruitless, he next urged the necessity of securing beforehand a superiority on their own proper element, the sea; and for this purpose proposed to convert into sinews of war the treasures with which Crœsus, king of Lydia, had enriched the temple of Apollo at Branchidæ; as the best or only means of replenishing their own military chest, and preventing the gold, as well as the temple, from falling into the hands of the enemy. This proposal was also rejected; and it was decided to leave the sanctuary in the enjoyment of its wealth, and prosecute the scheme of revolt with the other limited means at their disposal. During the vicissitudes of the disastrous war which ensued, Hecatæus was author of other prudent counsels which, if followed, might have helped to avert the calamities that afterwards befell his native city. His advice was[2] that Aristagoras should strongly fortify the isle of Leros, as a central military and naval station, on which he

[1] Herodot. v. 36.

[2] Herodot. v. 125.

might fall back if dispossessed of Miletus, or from which he might concert measures for restoring the fortunes of the war on the neighbouring continent. His advice was again overruled. But this notice of Herodotus connects itself in an interesting manner with an inscription lately discovered in the island, containing a decree by which Hecatæus, whether the historian or some one of his descendants, is specially honoured as a founder or benefactor by the Lerians.[1] After the reestablishment of the Persian supremacy, Hecatæus, as we learn from Diodorus[2], was deputed by his countrymen to plead for a mitigation of the penalties imposed by their conquerors. On his inquiry of the satrap Artaphernes, why the Ionians still continued to be objects of so great jealousy to the imperial government, the answer was: that men who had the evils recently inflicted on them by a victorious enemy still fresh in their memories, could not but be objects of suspicion to their masters. To which Hecatæus replied: If past injuries are a source of hatred, might not acts of benevolence produce in their turn feelings of gratitude and confidence? Artaphernes, struck with the justice of the remark, henceforward not only adopted a milder policy towards his Greek dependents, but restored to them their antient forms of local government. This reestablishment of constitutional law in the Asiatic Greek colonies by Mardonius (not Artaphernes as in Diodorus), after the Milesian revolt, is specially mentioned by Herodotus[3], but without any notice of Hecatæus as having been instrumental to the change. Numerous other

[1] Ross, Inscript. Gr. inedit. fascic. II. p. 28. sqq., Athens, 1842.
[2] Excerpt. Vat., ed. Maj. p. 38.
[3] VI. 43.: see infra, Ch. vi. § 17.

authors of note bear testimony to the high estimation in which Hecatæus was held by his countrymen, both on account of his extensive knowledge and of his personal merit.[1]

His Periodus, or Description of the earth.

3. Of the only two works ascribed to Hecatæus[2], one, entitled Periodus, or Travels round the earth, also Description of the earth, was of the strictly geographical order. The other, of the logographic order, is sometimes cited under the title of Genealogies, sometimes under that of Histories. The Periodus possesses a peculiar interest, as being the earliest work of its kind the remains of which are sufficiently copious to furnish any clear notion of its character; and as embodying the earliest complete system of Greek geography. It seems to have been little more than what, in the technical language of the antients, was called a Periplus, or Circumnavigation; a description, namely, of the coasts of the Mediterranean, and of those of other neighbouring seas, in so far as explored. Such was at this early period the most popular, if not the only species of Greek geographical compendium; the difficulty of access to the interior of the continents, concurring with a proportional indifference to their condition, to maintain them in their primitive state of obscurity. The extent and method of the periplus of Hecatæus will be best appreciated by reference to the accompanying map[3], constructed from the remains of the original text. The interior of each country will there, as a general rule, be found blank; while the seacoasts, unless in some few in-

[1] Heraclit. ap. Diog. Laert. ix. § 1.; Strab. i. p. 7., xiv. p. 635.; Agathem. i. 1.; Cercidas, ap. Ælian. V. H. xiii. 20.; Solinus, 45.

[2] Suid. v. Ἑλλάνικος: conf. Klausen, Frgg. Hecat. p. 13.; Didot, Frgg. p. xi.; Strab. i. p. 7.

[3] Appendix C.

stances, where their barbarous state, or other causes, rendered them less accessible to the Greek navigator, are studded with names. To this rule however there are exceptions, the most remarkable of which is Egypt, a country consisting in fact but of the shores of one great navigable river, and assuming consequently, even in its interior, much the character of a maritime region. Its greater accessibility to the Ionian Greeks, with its own peculiar sources of attraction, could also hardly fail to procure it a prominent place in any work of this class. Egypt is the only one of the countries comprised by Hecatæus in his Periodus, which we know from positive testimony, that of Herodotus, to have been visited by himself. His own personal character, however, with the credit which he enjoyed for zealous historical research, and the general accuracy of his notices, can leave little doubt of his having explored the more accessible of the localities which he describes, especially the coasts of Greece, southern Italy, Thrace, Asia minor, Syria, and the Carthaginian province of Libya. The only previous author whom he cites, and that but twice, is Homer.[1]

Hecatæus looked upon the earth as one great continent, consisting of two principal divisions, Europe to the north-west, and Asia to the south-east. These divisions were separated by the irregular line of sea which extends from the Pillars of Hercules to the coast of Colchis on the north-eastern extremity of the Euxine; and were there united by the mountain ridge of Caucasus, stretching from the Euxine to the Caspian sea. In regard to the outer extremities of this continent, Hecatæus, deferring to the popular doc-

[1] Frgg. 145. 227.

trine of the primitive cosmogony, assumed the habitable earth to be surrounded by a body of water, called, in the poetical language which, whether in a poetical or a literal sense, he seems also to have adopted, the River Ocean. From this circumfluent ocean, not only all the great seas, gulfs, or lakes of the continent, but several of the larger rivers, the sources of which remained unexplored by the Greeks, were supposed to emanate.[1] The passage of Herodotus[2], in which he sneers at the "writers of travels round the world, who drew the earth as a circular plane surrounded by the river ocean, and Europe as equal in size to Asia," has been supposed, with reason, to be aimed at Hecatæus. The term "Periodus" here used by Herodotus, the Periodus of Hecatæus being at that time the only publication of note so entitled, or in which the divisions of the earth were limited to two, Europe and Asia, can leave little doubt on the subject. This interpretation of the passage is confirmed by another taunt thrown out by Herodotus, in the same context, against those who supposed the Nile to be an emanation from this river ocean, a doctrine which also appears to have been entertained by Hecatæus.

In spite, however, of the cavil of Herodotus, and of the crude notion of Hecatæus himself regarding the source of the Nile, the Oceanic theory of the latter was not only one natural for a Greek of that age to entertain, but which has been shown by modern research to be substantially true. Every attempt of the Greeks themselves to explore the outer extremities of the earth had shown it to be bounded by water. It was, therefore, a plausible inference that a similar boundary existed in the unex-

[1] Frg. 339.: conf. 278. [2] iv. 36.

plored extremities; and admitting ice, by which Hecatæus[1] knew the northern continent to be bounded, to rank as a portion of the circumfluent water, the western hemisphere is now ascertained to be, as Hecatæus believed, a large island.

The "Description of the earth" was, by reference to the two grand divisions of the thing described, itself divided into two parts; the one entitled Europe, the other Asia. Libya or Africa, which afterwards formed a quarter by itself, was but a part of Asia in the system of Hecatæus. Egypt was distributed by him between the two Asiatic provinces of Arabia and Libya, the Nile forming the boundary; a method retained in the subsequent Greek geography, where the Nile separated Asia and Libya. This splitting of one narrow country between two different provinces, a country, moreover, so uniform in its own character and that of its inhabitants, and so broadly distinguished from its neighbours, is certainly a singular arrangement. The Red Sea, and the narrow isthmus between that sea and the Mediterranean, offer so much apter a boundary, that, even had the right and left banks of the Nile been occupied by different races, it is not likely that any modern geographer would have imagined another mode of division. With the Greeks, however, the force of this reasoning was little felt. Their notions of the extent or form of the Arabian gulf were not very definite; and it is even doubtful whether Hecatæus did not suppose it to be a lake; while their veneration for the Nile, on account of the grandeur and beneficence of its stream, and of the vast extent to which it intersects the southern continent, seemed to give it

[1] Frg. 160.

an almost divine claim to the honour of bounding the two main divisions of that continent. Here, however, another question arose: How were the islands of the river, especially the great cluster of them which forms the Delta, to be disposed of; as lying neither on the one nor the other bank, but in the bosom of the stream? This question was a source of some embarrassment, as we know, to Herodotus; and may probably have been so also to Hecatæus; but his remains afford no indication of the mode in which he may have attempted to solve it.[1]

There is no reason to doubt that the division of this work into two books or parts, under the titles of Europe and Asia, originates with its author. So antiquated a method of arrangement was not likely to have suggested itself to the grammarians, to whom we are in many other instances indebted for the Books and Chapters of the early classics. The subordinate parts of the Asia are also occasionally quoted by titles derived from separate regions or provinces; such as "Æolica," "Egypt," "Libya."[2] No similar subdivisions of the Europe can be recognised.

Genuine

The genuine character of this work was disputed

[1] Herodotus (II. 15, 16.) ridicules the doctrine of certain "Ionian Greeks," who, while they admitted three "quarters" of the earth, Europe, Asia, and Libya, denied that Egypt proper, which they restricted to the Delta, belonged either to Asia or to Libya. "If so," he remarks, "Egypt would require to be classed by itself as a fourth quarter." The conjecture of modern commentators (C. Müller in frgg. 295, 296.), that Herodotus here, as in the previous case of the river Ocean, has Hecatæus more immediately in view in his sneering allusion to "Ionian Greeks," is set aside by the facts: first, that while Hecatæus admitted but two main divisions of the earth, the "Ionians" ridiculed by Herodotus are said by him to have admitted three; and secondly, that Hecatæus describes several cities on the upper Nile as situated in Egypt (frgg. 267. sqq.), whereas the Ionians in question restricted Egypt to the Delta.

[2] Frgg. 212, 213. 264, 265. 271. alibi.

by Callimachus the grammarian and poet of the Alexandrian era, on grounds which have not been recorded.[1] His opinion was combated by his contemporary Eratosthenes, a more competent judge in such matters, supported by Strabo and other leading geographers who cite Hecatæus as an authority. Among the arguments used by Eratosthenes and Strabo in favour of their opinion[2], was the correspondence between the style of the Periodus and that of the Genealogies of the same author, the genuine character of which latter work does not seem ever to have been questioned. There can be no reasonable doubt that Eratosthenes was right. It is highly improbable in itself that a book of such general notoriety as the Periodus enjoyed in the time of Herodotus, and so frequently alluded to by that author, should not only have been lost, but supplanted by another spurious production during the century, or little more, that intervened between Herodotus and Callimachus. Nor, in the remains of the Periodus, can any symptoms be recognised of the handiwork of an Alexandrian bookmaker. They are pregnant throughout, in the names and notices of the places described, and in the style of the description, with a savour of primitive Ionian antiquity unlikely to have been imparted by any spurious agency[3]

character of the Periodus.

4. From the order still observable in the arrangement of the localities in the bulkier extant fragments, it appears that Hecatæus commenced his description of each division of the earth with the countries on

Arrangement of its contents.

[1] Ap. Athen. II. p. 70.: conf. Arr. Exp. Alex. v. 6.
[2] Strabo, I. p. 7.
[3] Conf. Klausen, p. 22. See Appendix D.

the Hellespont.[1] Thence he proceeded, first on the European side of the Euxine northwards round that sea till he reached the Asiatic frontier at the Cimmerian Bosphorus. He then, returning to his previous starting-point, coasted southwards along the shores of Thrace and Greece, taking on his way the islands of the Ægæan, which appear, except a few of the smallest on the immediate coast of Asia, to have been comprised in his Europe.[2] From the southern shores of Greece he continued his course northwards along those of Epirus; across the Adriatic to Italy; round the coasts of that country; taking Sicily and other islands by the way; and along the shore of Liguria, Gaul, and Spain, to the Pillars of Hercules. On the Asiatic side he adopted a similar method; sailing first northwards round the south-eastern shore of the Euxine to the Cimmerian point of junction with his European track; and then resuming, as formerly, his Hellespontian point of departure, he proceeded south-eastward along the shores of Asia minor, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and up the Nile. Returning once more to the northern point of junction, his line of description traversed mount Caucasus to the Caspian sea, which, according to Hecatæus, communicated with the Eastern ocean. Thence turning southwards and westwards along the Indian, Persian, and Arabian shores, real or imaginary, of that ocean, he fell in with the extremity of his previous route up the Nile. From the mouth of that river he proceeded along the coast of Libya, by Carthage, to the Pillars of Hercules; where he met the western extremity of his European course.

[1] Klausen, Fragg. p. 14.; Didot, p. 11.
[2] Frgg. 98. sqq. 226.

The fragments of the Periodus are so numerous as to warrant the belief that they represent a large portion of the substance of the original text; and might perhaps admit of being fashioned into a skeleton of what was, even when entire, but a meagre and fleshless body. They amount in all to about 330; of which nearly 300 are found in the vocabulary of Stephanus Byzantinus. As these names, numerous as they are, could not have formed the whole of those contained in the original work of Hecatæus, the question arises: Upon what grounds did Stephanus proceed in making his selection; or rather, in quoting Hecatæus preferably to other geographers, as a special authority in regard to particular places? That his selection was not dictated solely by the importance of each locality, is evident from the circumstance that neither Athens, nor Argos, nor Ephesus, nor many other Greek cities of note, find a place in his list. Among the other motives which might suggest themselves, a very natural one would be the circumstance of the Periodus being either the only, or the oldest work of Greek geography in which the name cited occurred; and the evidence supplied by this peculiarity to the antiquity of both name and place. Importance might also attach to any antiquated singularity of form, in which the name appeared, or to the curiosity of the notices by which it was accompanied. The influence of each of these motives appears to be exemplified in portions of the compilation. It contains, however, a number of names to which none of those causes seem to apply, and the selection of which can only be attributed to the caprice or fancy of the Byzantine compiler.

But by whatever motives, in individual cases, the Countries

omitted or neglected.

choice of Stephanus may have been influenced, the numbers and positions of the names in his list may be understood to represent at least the proportions in which those of the entire body from which they were culled were distributed on the map of Hecatæus. By far the greater part accordingly are clustered, as was natural, on the coasts and islands of Hellas itself, or on other central points of Hellenic civilisation; and the number decreases, as a general rule, much in the same ratio as the distance or inaccessibility of the place augments. Hence, where any marked exceptions to this rule are observable, such as the occurrence of blanks in regions where detail might have been expected, there is fair ground to assume that some special cause had interfered with the author's prosecution of his researches. On the south coast of Italy, for example, up to the Bay of Naples, the names are almost as frequent as on the coasts of the Ægæan. But from that bay northwards, on the same side of the peninsula, we have a vacant space of between 300 and 400 miles. The numerous and already flourishing Pelasgian or Etruscan cities of that coast, inclusive of the mighty Rome, already engaged, like an infant Hercules, in strangling her indigenous rivals before commencing her career of foreign conquest, are passed over; and the next place mentioned is a petty Ligurian seaport, to the west of modern Genoa, appropriately called by the name it still bears of Monœcus, or "Solitary dwelling." From this point, along the comparatively inhospitable coasts of Gaul and Spain, a name occurs here and there; usually that of some Greek or Phœnician colony, such as Massilia, Narbo, Sicania. On each side of the Straits, within the immediate sphere of Phœ-

nician influence, the towns become more frequent, and in the neighbourhood of Carthage are clustered almost as thickly as on the coast of Greece. To the east of Carthage is another dreary waste of about a thousand miles relieved by a few notices of Libyan tribes, until we approach the shore of the Delta. Similar blanks are observable on the eastern coast of upper Italy; and on the west coast of the Euxine.[1]

5. The existence of these blanks appears quite natural in several of the cases where they occur; such as the African Syrtes eastward of Carthage, the north-western shores of the Euxine, and those of the upper Adriatic; these being all, in the days of Hecatæus, comparatively uncivilised regions. But it is not so easy to explain the vacuity on the coast of Tyrrhenia, northward of Naples. There existed here all the inducements to a more detailed notice, which the interest and curiosity of a state of civilisation, already far advanced but as yet little familiar to the Greeks, ought to have held out. Nor can it be supposed that the neglect is on the part of the compiler rather than of the original author. It is far from likely that Stephanus, in drawing so copiously from the text of a primitive geographer regarding so many countries familiar to the Greeks from the time of Homer downwards, should have omitted to quote him where his notices would have possessed so clear an advantage of novelty and originality. The inference therefore must be, that some special obstacle existed to the Greek traveller's closer acquaintance with this part of Italy. May not such an obstacle

[1] Crete, Cyprus, Sardinia, and Corcyra are similarly neglected; from which it may be inferred that Hecatæus paid less attention to islands than to continents.

be discovered in a feeling of national animosity entertained by the Italian states towards the Hellenes? There can be no doubt that what is usually characterised as the enlightened spirit of Greek colonial enterprise, was also a spirit of piracy and usurpation. The first thought of a body of Hellenic citizens, on finding the world too narrow for them at home, was to set sail, generally in a westerly direction, and seize on the nearest city or territory worth possessing, or the existing owners of which they thought themselves strong enough to eject or enslave. In this way they had occupied the whole coast of southern Italy, and were daily endeavouring to extend their settlements in that region, and in the neighbouring islands of the Mediterranean. It was therefore quite natural that the states of those countries should close their ports against Greek vessels, as more likely to be the bearers of enemies and plunderers than of friendly visitors. There is accordingly no allusion in any early classic to amicable relations between the Hellenes and the Tyrrhenian republics. The only mention of dealings between them, in the copious historical miscellany of Herodotus[1], is his account of the resistance jointly offered by the Tyrrhenians and Phœnicians to a series of those same piratical outrages by a body of Greek adventurers. Nor does it seem a fortuitous coincidence that Herodotus, while enlarging so much and so often on the geography of other less remarkable regions, should have abstained from all special notice of central Italy. The opportunity which his account of the battle between the Phocæan and the Tyrrheno-Phœnician fleets off the coast of Corsica supplied for a description of the native

[1] I. 166.

country of the Tyrrhenians, was at least as favourable as that afforded by the Persian inroad into Libya, for his elaborate account[1] of the barbarous tribes of that region. It can hardly be the result of mere accident, that the leading geographer and the leading historian of this period should agree in their silence as to a country which was, a few generations afterwards, to exercise so powerful an influence on the destinies of Greece and of the world.

The comparatively copious account given of the Asiatic shores of the Euxine, would imply that the geographer's own travels had extended in that direction to the European point of junction; perhaps across the ridge of Caucasus to the frontiers of Media. Beyond the latter country he is not likely to have carried his personal researches. For his vague and scanty notions of India, Persia proper, and other countries on the Southern ocean, he may have been indebted to Scylax, or to some native oriental authority.

Characteristics of his research.

Even in its original integrity the narrative of the Periodus must have been but meagre. The extant fragments are little more than names of places and founders; with an occasional sentence or two of commentary. Two examples alone[2] occur of notations of distance from place to place. Many of the names are such as were obsolete or antiquated in later times; and appear to have been selected on that account by the authors who quote them. Of fabulous localities the list is almost free; and but few legends of marvellous or supernatural phenomena are introduced. The Sciapodæ, or Shade-footed Africans, are mentioned[3], but without the mythical etymology of their

[1] IV. 145. [2] Frgg. 163. 303. [3] Frg. 265.

names authorised by Scylax. The Pygmies are also described[1], with their wars against the cranes celebrated in poetical tradition since the time of Homer. Both these fables seem to have a basis of fact. The Sciapodæ are the splay-footed negro race. The Pygmies assume a still more evident reality in the person of the Bushmen of central Africa, the most diminutive men known to exist. The identity of this race with the classical Pygmies is further confirmed in the account given by Herodotus[2] of other neighbouring African tribes, whom he describes as living in caves, feeding on reptiles, and speaking a language like the chattering of bats. For the Bushmen live in caves, feed on carrion; and their dialect consists in great part of sounds more like the cackling of birds than the articulations of the human voice. The war with the cranes also finds a parallel in the fact, that the life of the Bushmen is one of continual self-defence against the wild animals of the desert which they inhabit.

In his antiquarian and etymological commentaries, Hecatæus shows himself an orthodox adherent of the popular creed, also subscribed to by Herodotus, which assumed the name of almost every country or city to have been derived from that of a hero by whom it was founded. Among other examples, Media was called after Medus son of Medea[3]; Phocis derived its name from Phocus, who was father of Crisus founder of Crisa. Chios was called after Chius son of Ocean, or after a nymph Chios, or from the quantity of snow (chion) which fell in the island.[4] Of properly historical founders no names occur. The nearest ap-

[1] Frg. 266. [2] iv. 183. sq. [3] Frg. 171.
[4] Frgg. 84. 87, 88. 99. 139. 351.

proach to one is that of Cnopus son of Codrus; from whom the Ionian city of Erythræ is said to have derived its surname Cnopopolis.[1] The only colony of acknowledged historical age, the foundation of which is assigned to its real authors, is Massilia.

The more detailed geographical commentaries of Hecatæus seem to have been chiefly bestowed upon Egypt. He described the phœnix, the hippopotamus, and the mode of catching the crocodile.[2] He speculated on the causes of the rise of the Nile, which river he supposed to be an emanation from the Southern ocean.[3] He repudiated, however, another doctrine founded on the same Oceanic theory, as to an underground communication between the sources of certain celebrated pairs of rivers or fountains bearing the same names; of the Peloponnesian Inachus for example, and the Amphilochian Inachus.[4] Like Herodotus he considered the Delta as a comparatively new country formed by the alluvial deposit of the Nile. In the account given by him of the floating island of Chemmis[5], for which he is ridiculed by Herodotus[6], he seems merely to have repeated what the Egyptian priests told him; as Herodotus himself has done with equal complacency in regard to many quite as incredible matters. The citation by Photius of Hecatæus Milesius, as the authority from whom Diodorus borrowed his Egyptian version of the Exodus, has usually, and perhaps justly been considered an error of Photius; and the passage has been assigned by preference to the later Hecatæus of Abdera, author of a work on Jewish history.[7] The

[1] Frg. 215. [2] Frg. 292. [3] Frg. 278.
[4] Frg. 72. [5] Frg. 284. [6] II. 156.
[7] Frg. 372.; Diodor. Exc. ex lib. 40. ap. Phot. Cod. 244.

argument however in favour of this view, that a Greek historian of so early a period is not likely to have been acquainted with the name or history of Moses, is in some degree invalidated by the fact that the Jewish lawgiver was mentioned by Hellanicus the younger contemporary of Hecatæus. That the Milesian geographer also possessed a certain local knowledge of Palestine, appears from his familiarity with its real name Canaan, as quoted by him under the variety or corruption of Chnâ.[1]

His genealogical work.

6. The "Genealogies" of Hecatæus narrated, like those of Acusilaus, the pedigrees and adventures of the heroes of the mythical age. The two works appear indeed, in all fundamental respects, to have resembled each other. The only material difference seems to have been that while Acusilaus, in emulation of his master Hesiod, devoted a large share of attention to the theogony, or divine department of mythical genealogy, the theological matter of Hecatæus was restricted to what was required in the way of introduction to his human lines of descent. His order of succession opened, not with Chaos, Uranus, or Terra, but with Deucalion, as the originator of terrestrial life. The work was divided into books, four of which are cited in the fragments; but the same notices afford no clear insight into the order in which the subjects were arranged. Among the enterprises narrated, prominence appears to have been given to the Argonautic expedition, and to the labours of Hercules. The warlike adventures of the Amazons were also noticed. The parts of Greece to the affairs of which the greatest number of extant passages relate, are Thessaly, Argos, and Arcadia. The impor-

[1] Frg. 254.

tation of the alphabet into Greece was assigned to Cadmus.[1] Hecatæus also described the sojourn in Attica of the tribe of Pelasgians who afterwards migrated to Lemnos; and gave an account of the cause of that migration, which is controverted by Herodotus as unfair towards the Athenians.[2]

The exordium of this work contained a denunciation by Hecatæus of the absurdity of the Greek fabulous legends, and an expression of his determination to treat his own subjects with a greater regard than preceding authors to truth and common sense. If he has fulfilled this declaration to his own satisfaction, he has certainly not done so to that of his more intelligent readers, antient or modern; there being few authors who seem to have manifested a greater deference to those extravagancies of the popular mythology which he professed to contemn. He is quoted, for example, as an authority in support of the legend, repudiated by less credulous mythologers, that the ram of Phrixus was endowed with human speech. His spirit of credulity also displays itself in his attempts to elicit fact from fable by the crucible of allegorical interpretation; attempts which, as frequently happens even with more ingenious interpreters, result but in the substitution of still more extravagant fables for those which it is proposed to explain away. The legend of Hercules dragging Cerberus from Hades originated, according to Hecatæus[3], in a monstrous serpent which haunted a cave in Cape Tænarus, and from its ferocity and deadly bite had acquired the name of Dog of Death, but was overcome and brought alive to Argos by Hercules.

[1] Frg. 361. [2] Frg. 362. [3] Frg. 346.

His dialect and style.

The dialect of Hecatæus is characterised by an intelligent grammarian[1] as the purest model of the Ionic; and as such is contrasted with the mixed dialect of Herodotus. The distinction has been explained above, as implying that while Hecatæus was content with his native Milesian forms of the common Ionian tongue, the idiom of Herodotus was a compound of the varieties specified by himself as spoken in the several Ionian states of Asia minor, with an admixture of old Homeric phraseology. The existing remains of Hecatæus can hardly supply a fair criterion for estimating the peculiar character of his dialect, having, it is probable, been subjected to the usual alterations by successive generations of transcribers. Judging, however, from the nature of the Ionisms which remain, Hecatæus would seem to have been more sparing of those combinations of liquid vowels in which Herodotus so greatly indulges. His language also presented occasional words or forms rare or obsolete both in the common Ionic and the classical Greek[2], and which may probably have been Milesian idioms. His style, although of the "disjointed" or sententious order, was yet considered so agreeable and correct, as to have obtained him a place among the standards of classical Hellenic prose.[3] The fragments also offer some curious examples of the tendency to poetical phraseology in primitive logographic style. The latter part of the subjoined sentence is a hexameter verse, one half of which is borrowed from Homer:

[1] Hermog. De form. Orat. p. 402., ed. 1569.
[2] Frgg. 354. 358. 366, 367. 369. 371.
[3] Hermog. loc. cit.: conf. Long. de Sub. 27.

Κάπρος ἦν ἐν τῷ ὄρει καὶ Ψωφιδίους κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργεν.[1]

The following passage[2], which seems to be a literal extract from the "Genealogy," is a characteristic example both of his sententious quaintness of expression, and of his method of mythological and etymological investigation:

Ὀρεσθεὺς ὁ Δευκαλίωνος ἦλθεν εἰς Αἰτωλίαν ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ· καὶ κύων αὐτῷ στέλεχος ἔτεκε· καὶ ὃς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν κατορυχθῆναι· καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔφυ ἄμπελος πολυστάφυλος· διὸ καὶ τὸν αὑτοῦ παῖδα Φύτιον ἐκάλεσε. Τούτου δὲ Οἰνεὺς ἐγένετο, κληθεὶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμπέλων. Οἱ γὰρ παλαιοὶ Ἕλληνες οἴνας ἐκάλουν τὰς ἀμπέλους. Οἰνέως δὲ ἐγένετο Αἰτωλός.

Orestheus, son of Deucalion, arrived in Ætolia, in search of a kingdom. Here his dog produced him a green plant. Upon which he ordered the dog to be buried in the earth; and from its body sprang a vine fertile in grapes. Hence he called his son Phytius. The son of Phytius was Œneus, so named after the vine plant. For the antient Greeks called the vine Œna. The son of Œneus was Ætolus.

This laconic accumulation of trivial fables, and equally trivial etymological puns[3], is singularly characteristic of the mode in which credulity and love of the marvellous were combined in this author and in the public for whom he wrote, with that good sense and clear judgement which distinguished both in the practical business of life.

[1] Frg. 344.: conf. Il. ε. 175. [2] Frg. 341.: conf. 332.

[3] The play of words is not only between Οἰνεύς and οἶνη, but between κύων and κύω, Φύτιος and φύω.

## DIONYSIUS OF MILETUS

Dionysius of Miletus.

was contemporaneous with Hecatæus; and the mode in which their names are coupled together in the citations [1], implies that they coincided in some of their principal historical views. This similarity seems to have extended to the still earlier Milesian patriarchs of prose literature, Cadmus and Anaximander. The four have been classed accordingly in a former page as forming a Milesian school or sect of historical composition.[2]

Of the personal history of Dionysius nothing has been recorded, nor do his writings appear to have enjoyed much popularity. Neither their titles nor their subjects have been mentioned by any author of credit; and such notices of them as occur in the later grammarians are of little value, owing to the palpable manner in which the name of the Milesian Dionysius is confounded with that of other later Dionysii, writers for the most part little more celebrated than himself, and concerning whose persons and labours the same uncertainty exists. The following titles are enumerated under the head of Dionysius Milesius, in the compilation of Suidas[3]: On the events subsequent to Darius; a Periegesis, or Description of the Earth; Persica; Troïca; Mythica; and a Historical cycle. Another grammarian [4] quotes him as author of Argonautica.

Confounded with other Dionysii.

The Periegesis, ascribed in other articles of Suidas to other Dionysii, is probably that still extant,

[1] Suid. v. Ἑκαταῖος.
[2] Vol. I. p. 76. note: conf. Dionys. frg. 1. Did. vol. II.
[3] v. Διονύσιος.
[4] Schol. ad Apollon. Rh. III. 200. alibi.

by a Dionysius of the Roman period but of uncertain birthplace, a work which enjoyed sufficient credit to procure its author the surname of Periegetes or the Geographer. That the author of the Historical cycle was Dionysius of Samos may be considered certain; such being the title of the most popular composition of that writer; to which he too was indebted for his special surname of Cyclographer. The claim of Dionysius of Mitylene to the Mythica, Troïca, and Argonautica is also recognised by Suidas[1] in his notice of that mythographer, and by other authorities.[2] There remain, consequently, for the older Dionysius, with the same Suidas, but the Persica, or Persian history, and the treatise On the events subsequent to Darius. The latter has been conjectured by modern commentators to have been a supplement to the other more comprehensive work on Persia, bringing the affairs of that country down to a later epoch of the author's own life, than that to which the main body of his history had extended. Admitting these compositions to be genuine, Dionysius would be entitled to rank as the first Greek historian of real events. It is, however, obviously far from probable, had such a work been extant by a contemporary author of good credit, on a subject of such great and engrossing national interest as the invasion of Xerxes, that it would never have been quoted or mentioned but in a single notice of a confused Byzantine compiler, in the copious commentaries for which the details of that subject supplied material in the subsequent ages of Greek

[1] v. Διονύσ. Μιτυληναῖος.

[2] Diodor. Sic. III. 52. 66.; Schol. Apoll. Rh. I. 1289., conf. Welcker Ep. Cycl. p. 81. sqq.; C. Müller, ap. Didot, Fragg. vol. II. p. 6. sqq.

historical literature. In the face of this difficulty, and of the numerous other blunders of which Suidas has been convicted in regard to his various Dionysii and their works, these Persian histories, if they ever existed, cannot with any confidence be assigned to Dionysius of Miletus.

There are but two citations which can safely be referred to the text of any work, real or supposititious, of this author. One of them alludes to him as having, in conjunction with Anaximander and other early historians, ascribed the importation of the alphabet into Greece to Danaus rather than Cadmus.[1] The other relates to his mode of writing the name of mount Hæmus. As neither of these passages is in the form of an extract, they supply no criteria for judging of the author's style.

## CHARON OF LAMPSACUS

Charon of Lampsacus.

7. is the first prose author ascertained to have selected his subjects from historical times; and he also appears to have treated them in a rational and honest spirit. He may, therefore, in regard to the fundamental requisites of their common art, fairly compete with Herodotus for the honourable title of Father of history. Of his personal affairs nothing has been recorded but the fact of his being a native of Lampsacus, an Ionian colony of Phrygia, situated not far from the coast of the Hellespont. His father's name is mentioned under the two varieties of Pytheas and Pythocles.[2] His flourishing age is placed by competent authority after the close of the

[1] Frg. 1. [2] Pausan. x. xxxviii. 6.; Suid. v. Χάρων.

Persian, and prior to the commencement of the Peloponnesian war; and as he mentioned transactions which took place during the reign of Artaxerxes, he must have outlived 464 B. C., the year of that monarch's accession to the Persian throne.[1]

His works.

Of the works ascribed to Charon, those possessing positive claims to genuine character were three in number: the Persica, in two books; the Annals of Lampsacus, in four books[2]; and the Chronicles of Lacedæmonian kings. Other titles given in the apocryphal list of Suidas are: Hellenica, in four books; Cretica, in three books; Æthiopica; Libyca; Origenes, in two books; and a Periplus of the coasts beyond the Pillars of Hercules.[3] Of these titles several may probably represent works of later historians bearing the same name or other names of similar sound. Some, such as the Æthiopica and Libyca, may have been parts of the Persica, treating events of Persian history connected with Æthiopia or Libya. The Hellenica, if not by Charax, author of a book under that title, may have been a distinct work of Charon though not ascribed to him by any writer of credit. His authorship of the Origenes, though equally unpro-

[1] Dion. Hal. de præcip. Historr. 3., Jud. de Thucyd. 5.; Suid. v. Χάρων; Plut. in Themist. 27., conf. Didot, vol. 1. frgg. 1. 4

[2] Charon's researches into the history of his native republic seem to be cited under three titles: Ὧροι Λαμψακηνῶν, Ὅροι Λαμψακηνῶν, and περὶ Λαμψάκου. Suid. v. Χάρων: conf. Didot, frgg. and pref. p. xix. sqq. As the best mode of settling the subtle question regarding the connexion or distinction of these three titles, they have here been assumed to denote a single work, designated in our text by the first title of the three. It is obviously not probable that an author so much engaged as Charon was with other more ambitious subjects, should have devoted three separate works to so insignificant a place as Lampsacus, although his native town; one to its Annals, another to its Boundaries, a third to its affairs in general. In the first and second titles, the duplicate form evidently originates in the ambiguity of the early orthography.

[3] C. Müller, ap. Didot, p. xvii.

vided with competent testimony, has also been admitted by modern commentators, on the ground that several of his fragments partake of the character peculiar to such compositions.

Materials supplied by them to Herodotus.

The researches of Charon are described by Dionysius of Halicarnassus[1] as extending over much of the ground afterwards more fully occupied by Herodotus:[2] and the points of correspondence which the fragments of Charon offer to parallel portions of the history of his great successor, are such as to leave little room for doubt that the latter was acquainted with his works. The dream of Astyages concerning his daughter Mandane mother of Cyrus, which forms so prominent an episode in Herodotus, had been previously narrated by Charon[3]: the variety of traditions current regarding the birth of Cyrus renders it the less likely that both authors should accidentally have preferred the same. The history of Pactyas the Lydian treasurer of Cyrus[4], of his treachery to his master, his flight to Cuma, and thence to Chios, where he fell into the hands of the Persians, was also narrated by both authors. The account of Charon here differed from that of Herodotus, in its omission to notice the ungenerous conduct towards the fugitive with which the latter charges the Chians. This omission has been urged by "Plutarch[5]," in his tract against Herodotus, as evidence that Charon was either

[1] De præcip. Historr. 3.

[2] That the great Græco-Persian war was treated in the Persica may be assumed from an extant citation of its text, referring to the events of that war. If, however, we admit that Charon also composed Hellenica or Hellenic histories in four books, the Persica being confined to two, it would be necessary to assume the greater part of the range of subjects mentioned by Dionysius to have been treated in the former work. The two may have constituted one series, extending, as appears from the author's notice of Artaxerxes, down to a late epoch of his own life.

[3] Frg. 4. [4] Frg. 1. [5] De Malig. Herod. 20.

ignorant of this part of the story, or had rejected it as a groundless calumny, which the same Plutarch accuses Herodotus of having too readily believed and maliciously promulgated. Modern critics[1], in the zeal of their admiration for Herodotus, have retorted on Plutarch at the expense of Charon, by assuming the latter to have suppressed the particulars discreditable to the Chians from a spirit of flattery towards those islanders. The account of the sack of Sardis[2] by the Athenians and Ionians was also common to the two authors. Here again Plutarch, citing Charon as a prior authority, accuses Herodotus of misrepresenting the facts of that adventure to the discredit of the Ionians; and here also, as in the affair of Pactyas, modern admirers[3] of the latter historian turn the tables, and reproach Charon with having, in the same spirit of favour to his countrymen, suppressed the details which were not to their credit. In the one as in the other case the charge seems to be about as well founded as the vindication. The only inference to be drawn by the impartial critic from a collation of the parallel texts of the two authors, is that Charon, in the quaint spirit of his age, was in each instance contented with a dry skeleton of the main facts which Herodotus has worked up into a more finished narrative. Charon, in his account of the disasters of Mardonius off the coast of Athos, also narrated by Herodotus, alluded to a superstitious dislike entertained by the Persians for white pigeons.[4] Herodotus enlarges on the same peculiarity of that people.

Charon is quoted by the genuine Plutarch among

[1] Dahlmann, Herodot. § 23. p. 117.
[2] Frg. 2.
[3] Dahlmann, op. cit. p. 118.
[4] Frg. 3.: conf. Herod. I. 138.

the more critical authorities who placed the flight of Themistocles from Athens to the Persian court under the reign of Artaxerxes, not under that of Xerxes according to the prevailing error on the subject.

As this author, in right of his Persica and Hellenica, takes rank as the first practical Greek historian, he may also claim, in right of his Spartan chronicle, to rank as the first practical Greek chronologer. This work, understood to have contained a digest of the tables of royal genealogy preserved at Lacedæmon, seems also to have been known to Herodotus, and cited by him with approval in a passage of his own history to be further noticed in a future page. Its loss is the more to be regretted, from its having embodied the substance of the oldest Greek state register possessing distinct claims to a genuine character. The only fragment of Charon which can with any probability be ascribed to this work is unfortunately of no historical value; mention being there made of the cup preserved at Sparta, and supposed to be that presented by Jupiter to Alcmena mother of Hercules, as a nuptial gift.[1]

In his Annals of Lampsacus Charon, overlooking the purely mythical ages of his native locality, appears to have treated of its vicissitudes from the time of the Ionian migration. He described[2] its previous possession by the indigenous race called Bebrycians, its occupation by adventurers of the royal Attic race of Codridæ, with its subsequent wars for the maintenance or extension of its boundaries.

Charon would also seem to have exercised a sound

[1] Frg. 11. [2] Frgg. 6. 7

judgement in questions of literary history and criticism; and is quoted by Pausanias[1] as a preferable testimony in regard to the controverted question of the authorship of the poem Naupactica.

But although this author gave so marked a preference, in the general selection of his subjects, to the realities of history, he does not appear to have denied, in their proper place, a reasonable share of attention to those elegant substrata of popular legend on which the historical annals of all the Greek states were founded. The two passages[2] of this nature that have been preserved, — the first describing the amour between Arcas and the hamadryad Prosopelia, the issue of which was the race of Arcadian mountaineers; the second a similar adventure, of which another wood nymph was the heroine,—indicate as much taste in the choice of his poetical embellishments, as he has shown judgement in that of his historical materials. He was also in the habit, like his successor Herodotus, of imparting popularity to his narrative by excursive anecdotes, which, while not so incredibly marvellous as to rank under the head of mythology, seldom possess pretension to the credit of historical fact. His longest extant fragment is a narrative of this kind, affording also a good specimen of the sententious order of historical style:

His style.

"The Bisaltians waged war against the Cardians, and were victorious in a battle. The commander of the Bisaltians was called Onaris. This man, when a youth, had been sold as a slave in Cardia, and had been made by his master to work at the trade of a barber. Now there was an oracle current among the Cardians, that about that time they should be invaded by the Bisaltians; and this oracle was a frequent subject of conversation

[1] x. 38. [2] Frgg. 12, 13.

among those who frequented the barber's shop. Onaris, having effected his escape home, persuaded his countrymen to invade Cardia, and was himself appointed leader of the expedition. But the Cardians were accustomed to teach their horses to dance to the sound of the flute in their festivals; when standing upright on their hind legs, they adapted the motions of their fore feet to the time of the music. Onaris being acquainted with this custom, procured a female flute-player from Cardia; and this flute-player, on her arrival in Bisaltis, instructed many of the flute-players of that city, whom he caused to accompany him in his march against the Cardians. As soon as the engagement commenced, he ordered the flute-players to strike up those tunes to which the Cardian horses were used to perform. And no sooner had the horses heard the music, than they stood up on their hind legs and began to dance. But the chief force of the Cardians was in cavalry; and so they lost the battle." [1]

## XANTHUS,

Xanthus the Lydian.

8. though familiarly called a Lydian, and described by some as a native of Sardis the Lydian metropolis[2], composed in the Greek language. There is at least no allusion to an original text of his work in

[1] Frg. 9.: conf. frg. 2. Βισάλται εἰς Καρδίην ἐστρατεύσαντο καὶ ἐνίκησαν. Ἡγέμων δὲ τῶν Βισαλτέων ἦν Ὄναρις. Οὗτος δέ, παῖς ὢν, ἐν τῇ Καρδίῃ ἐπράθη, καί τινι Καρδιηνῷ δουλεύσας κορσωτεὺς ἐγένετο. Καρδιηνοῖς δὲ λόγιον ἦν ὡς Βισάλται ἀπίξονται ἐπ' αὐτούς, καὶ πυκνὰ περὶ τούτου διελέγεντο ἐν τῷ κορσωτηρίῳ ἰζάνοντες. Καὶ ἀποδρὰς ἐκ τῆς Καρδίης εἰς τὴν πατρίδα τοὺς Βισάλτας ἐστειλεν ἐπὶ τοὺς Καρδιηνούς, ἀποδειχθεὶς ἡγέμων ὑπὸ τῶν Βισαλτέων. Οἱ δὲ Καρδιηνοὶ πάντες τοὺς ἵππους ἐδίδαξαν ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις ὀρχεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν αὐλῶν. Καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπισθίων ποδῶν ἱστάμενοι τοῖς προσθίοις ὠρχοῦντο ἐξεπιστάμενοι τὰ αὐλήματα. Ταῦτα οὖν ἐπιστάμενος Ὄναρις ἐκτήσατο ἐκ τῆς Καρδίης αὐλητρίδα. Καὶ ἀφικομένη ἡ αὐλητρὶς εἰς τοὺς Βισάλτας ἐδίδαξε πολλοὺς αὐλητάς, μεθ' ὧν δὴ καὶ στρατεύεται ἐπὶ τὴν Καρδίην. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ μάχη συνείστηκει, ἐκέλευσεν αὐλεῖν τὰ αὐλήματα ἅσα οἱ ἵπποι τῶν Καρδιηνῶν ἐξεπισταίατο. καὶ ἐπεὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ ἵπποι τοῦ αὐλοῦ ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπισθίων ποδῶν καὶ πρὸς ὄρχησμὸν ἐτράποντο. Τῶν δὲ Καρδιηνῶν ἡ ἰσχὺς ἐν τῇ ἵππῳ ἦν. Καὶ οὕτως ἐνικήθησαν.

[2] Suid. v. Ξάνθος: conf. Strab. XIII. p. 628.

the Lydian tongue; and his mode of treating his subject appears to have been adapted to the taste of the Greek public. The materials, however, of his work indicate, both in the oriental character of his own stock of original traditions, and in the oriental turn imparted to those common to other Greek historians, a mind more under the influence of Asiatic impressions than was usual with Greek colonial authors even in treating Asiatic subjects. His special connexion, by blood or citizenship, with the indigenous Lydian race, is further implied by the pointed terms in which he is characterised by the antients as "the Lydian;" for in respect to mere birth or residence in Lydia, any Ionian colonist on the banks of the Hermus or Mæander might have been equally so designated. Xanthus therefore may be assumed, either to have been a Greek naturalised in Sardis, or an indigenous Lydian, who with the Greek tongue had acquired Greek tastes and habits. The statement of Suidas, that his father bore the well known Lydian name of Candaules, would favour the latter view. These Asiatic traits in the character of Xanthus, with his habit of investigating Lydian history from indigenous sources, appear to be the principal cause of the value attached to his authority in Asiatic affairs.

His age coincides generally with that of Charon, and is established on similar data. We have the same statement of respectable writers, that he flourished prior to the Peloponnesian war and to Herodotus[1]; and we learn from a fragment of his text, that he survived the accession of Artaxerxes to the Persian

[1] Ephor. ap. Athen. xii. p. 515.; Dion. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 5.

throne in 464.[1] No particulars of his personal history have been transmitted.

His Lydiaca, or Lydian history.

His only authenticated work was his Lydiaca, or Lydian history, in four books. As his subject was not peculiarly interesting to the Greek public at large, the citations from his now lost text are not sufficiently numerous to afford any clear insight into its plan or extent. His researches appear to have been chiefly confined to the mythical annals of his country. He also entered at some detail on the geography of Lydia and the neighbouring regions; especially on the traces of old natural convulsions which they exhibited; and is quoted with special respect by Eratosthenes and Strabo, as an authority on those subjects.[2] He agreed with Herodotus in describing the popular Lydian god and hero Atys as the father of two sons, the eldest of whom, Lydus, was described by each historian as the patriarch of the Lydian nation. The two authors differ however as to the name and destinies of the brother of Lydus. Herodotus calls him Tyrrhenus, and describes him as emigrating during a famine in his native Lydia, with a body of his countrymen, to Italy; a portion of which peninsula was named after him.[3] Xanthus, who calls this younger brother Torrhebus, a mere variety, it may be presumed of Tyrrhenus, represented him as remaining, like Lydus, in Asia, and as patriarch of an Asiatic people called Torrhebians. Of the mythical connexion between Lydia and Greece through Hercules, or of the dynasty of Heraclid princes who figure in the Lydian history of Herodotus, there is no notice in the

[1] Eratosthen. ap. Strab. i. p. 49.: conf. frg. 3. Didot.
[2] Frgg. 3. 4.
[3] Frg. 1.

remains of Xanthus. The only royal names, with pretensions to historical character, which occur in those remains, Alcimus, Cambles, Adramytes, Aciamus, are unmentioned by Herodotus. It seems even doubtful whether the narrative of Xanthus extended through the later period, treated so much in detail by Herodotus, from the usurpation of Gyges down to the Persian conquest of Sardis. Not one of the successors of Gyges is noticed in the fragments of Xanthus; a circumstance which might almost warrant the suspicion that he had, like so many popular logographers of his day, confined his researches to the remoter ages of national history. He also treated of the neighbouring Asiatic races, Phrygians, Mysians, and Lycians. The Phrygians were described as having crossed from Thrace into Asia minor, after the Trojan war. The Mysians, classed by some geographers as also of Thracian descent, were claimed by Xanthus[1] as a tribe of Lydians which had emigrated to the region of mount Olympus; and this view he supported on philological grounds, characterising their dialect as a mixture of the Lydian, and of the language of the tribe of Phrygians among whom they settled. The only citation of Xanthus, and that of doubtful authenticity[2], where reference is made to the Hellenic colonies in Asia, is an appeal of Clemens Alexandrinus to his authority concerning the age of the Lesbian musician Terpander.

Among those peculiarities of the historical system of Xanthus which chiefly characterise it as the production of an Asiatic author, is the connexion into which he has brought the mythical annals of Lydia

[1] Frg. 8.
[2] Frg. 27.; probably a later Xanthus, author of a biographical work.

with those of more distant oriental races, especially of the Phœnicians. This connexion he traced in certain points of analogy between the popular divinities of the two nations; between the worship of Cybele, for example, or Magna mater, common to the indigenous races of Asia minor, and that of the Dea Syria, or great goddess of the Phœnicians, usually identified by the Greeks with their Aphrodite. Tantalus, a Lydian hero, whom the Greek mythologers made son of Jupiter, or of the Lydian mount Tmolus, was described by Xanthus as son of Hymen, who was with him father of Ascalon. The name Hymen is here probably the hellenised title of some Aphrodisian deity of Lydia, corresponding, perhaps, to the Eros of the Greeks, or Adonis of the Phœnicians. Ascalon undertakes an expedition to Syria, where he founds the city called after him; a city described by Herodotus as the most antient seat of the Phœnician goddess, where she was worshipped by the title of Atergatis in the form of a fish.[1] Both title and attribute were familiar to Xanthus. His version of the fable of Niobe[2] differed from that popular with the Greeks; and he explained[3] the custom of dedicating way-posts and land-marks to Hermes by a fable which, not being noticed by any earlier Greek mythologer, may be supposed of Lydian origin. These, and other legends of the same kind, cited from the Lydiaca, are marked by a tone of oriental mysticism foreign to the genius of the native Greek mythology. The marvellous anecdotes with which Xanthus enlivened the portions of his text professing to treat of human history, are also characterised by an eccentric wildness, reflecting a Lydo-Asiatic,

[1] Frgg. 11. 23. [2] Frg. 13. [3] Frg. 9.

rather than a Greek imagination. Such is the legend[1] of the Lydian king Cambles, celebrated for his voracious appetite. This royal glutton, being taken with a ravenous fit one night in his dreams, fell on his wife who lay by his side, and devoured her, all but one hand, which remained sticking in his jaws. Awakening in the morning, and finding his wife's hand in that position, while the rest of her person had disappeared, he became aware of the act he had committed; and, horrified by its enormity, destroyed himself. The author's legend of Niobe is characterised by a similar tone of gloomy ferocity. Among the fifteen or twenty authenticated citations of the Lydiaca, there is but one which contains a literal extract from the original text, the passage relative to Lydus and Torrhebus, quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[2] Brief as it is, it suffices to show that the style of Xanthus partook of the same sententious mannerism common to the native Ionian writers of that age.

Genuine character of the Lydiaca.

The genuine character of the Lydiaca was questioned, as we learn from Athenæus, by a single obscure commentator of the Roman period, called Artemon of Cassandra[3]; who pronounced it a forgery of Dionysius Scytobrachion, a grammarian and polyhistor of the Alexandrian school. Athenæus dismisses this scepticism as groundless, without either mentioning or combating the arguments on which it rested; nor is it alluded to by any other writer. A book quoted as valid authority by a succession of standard critics extending far back towards the age

[1] Frg. 12. [2] Frg. 1.

[3] Ap. Athen. xii. p. 515., conf. Müll. in Didot, Fragg. p. xxi.; Welcker in Seebod. Archiv. 1830, p. 70. sqq., conf. Cycl. Hom. p. 82.

of its author; by Ephorus [1], by Eratosthenes and his pupil Mnaseas, by Strabo and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, stood in need of no special defence against such attacks. An epitome of the Lydiaca, by one Menippus, a disciple of Diogenes the Cynic, is mentioned by that philosopher's namesake and biographer [2], apparently as extant in his own time.

Other reputed works.

Two other works are ascribed to Xanthus, each by a single author of recent age and small credit. The one, entitled Magica, is quoted by Clemens of Alexandria; the other, On the life of Empedocles, by Diogenes Laertius.[3] A life of Empedocles, his own contemporary, is not certainly a subject likely to have suggested itself to the Lydian historian; and as the name Xanthus is here used without the gentilic epithet, there is the more reason to believe that the later Athenian Xanthus, author of a biography of learned men, is the one alluded to.

The Magica appears, from the citation of Clemens, to have been a treatise on the Medo-Persian Magi; a subject quite within the scope of the Lydian logographer. The passage cited is also conceived in a spirit of bitterness against the Persians, very natural in a Lydian author of that period. There would, therefore, be no reason to doubt the fact, were it better attested, of such a work having been composed by Xanthus.

There remain the following nine writers of the class here set apart as flourishing prior to the Pelo-

[1] Every impartial reader must see, that however carelessly Athenæus may have expressed himself in this passage, his real meaning is that Ephorus had recognised as the genuine history of Xanthus the work afterwards ascribed by Artemon to Scytobrachion. See Appendix E.

[2] Diog. La. in Menippo, § 101. [3] Frgg. 28. sqq.

ponnesian war: Hippys of Rhegium, Deïochus of Proconnesus, Melesagoras, Eudemus of Paros, Democles of Phygela, Bion of Proconnesus, Eugeon of Samos, Simonides of Ceos, Xenomedes of Chios. These authors belong solely or chiefly to the half-century between the close of the Persian, and the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war; but neither the grammarians who cite them, nor their own fragments where any have been preserved, supply materials for a more definite adjustment of their dates. Of some of them little more than the names have been transmitted. We shall, therefore, pass them in review in the order in which they may seem entitled to rank, either by the importance of the subjects treated by them, or of the specimens of their labours which have been preserved.

### HIPPYS OF RHEGIUM

Hippys of Rhegium.

9. is the first recorded historical writer produced by the Italo-Greek colonies, and the first recorded historian of the western parts of Colonial Hellas inclusive of his native district.

His works.

Of his personal affairs no notices have been transmitted. The works attributed to him were: Chronica, in five books; Origines of Italian states; Sicula, in five books; and Argolica, in three books.[1] Several

[1] Suid. v. Ἵππυς. The latter part of this notice, οὗτος πρῶτος ἔγραψε παρῳδίαν καὶ χωλίαμβον, evidently refers, not to Hippys, but to Hipponax; and is one among the many examples of the confusion of facts and names in the Byzantine lexicographer's otherwise valuable compilation. Suidas describes Hippys as flourishing during the Persian war; but the general tenor of the fragments offers no indication of so early an age. If, on the other hand, the Petron cited in frg. 6. be the Greek physician so called, who flourished in the fourth century B. C., and not rather some early obscure Pythagorean philosopher of the same name, the age of Hippys would require to be greatly reduced.

of these titles have been plausibly conjectured by modern commentators to indicate subordinate portions of the work designated by the more general name of Chronica. The subjects chiefly preferred by Hippys were the foundation and vicissitudes of the Hellenic settlements in Italy and Sicily; and were comprised consequently, for the most part, within the limits of the historical age. But the citations from the Chronica also imply that the realities of his narrative were founded on a broad basis of mythology, extending back to the primeval Egyptian and Pelasgian patriarchs of Greece; and he is quoted as the first author who gave the Arcadians their boasted title of Proseleni, or "more antient than the Moon."[1] His researches extended to the fabulous annals of Corinth[2]; in connexion, it may be supposed, with the foundation of Syracuse by Corinthian colonists. The latter city is described by him[3] as having been at one time governed by an Argive king named Pollis, who transplanted the muscat grape from Italy to Sicily; a notice which gave occasion for some remarks on the etymology of the epithet "Biblian," applied by Homer to a species of wine. He also treated[4] of the worship of the local Sicilian deities called Palici, and of the miraculous attributes of their sanctuary. Another fragment[5] mentions the foundation of Croto and Sybaris; and an allusion to certain Pythagorean dogmas[6] was probably introduced in the portion of the text devoted to the former city, the favourite seat of the Samian philosopher. A passage of the Argolica, preserved by Ælian, is the only one that has reached us in the form of a literal extract.[7]

[1] Didot, frg. 2. [2] Frg. 3. [3] Frg. 7. [4] Frg. 5.
[5] Frg. 4. [6] Frg. 6. [7] Frg. 8.

It is here subjoined, as another characteristic specimen both of the matter and the manner common to the Greek prose logographers: His style.

"A woman was troubled with a tapeworm; and the physicians declared their inability to cure her. She therefore travelled to Epidaurus to supplicate relief from Æsculapius. The god was absent; but the servants of the sanctuary caused her to lie down in the place where he was in the habit of treating his patients; and the woman submissively complied. They then commenced their treatment of her, and separated her head from her body; when one of them inserted his hand and drew out the tapeworm; a monstrous specimen of the animal. But they were unable to readjust the head in its former position. At this juncture the god arrived; and chid them for attempting an operation beyond their powers. But he himself, by the omnipotence of his divine art, refitted the head to the neck, and raised the woman up restored to health."

It is remarkable that most of the longer passages cited from the early Greek historians, even from those who treated of real history, are devoted to such mythical or marvellous anecdotes. The inference naturally suggests itself, that their authority was more highly valued by posterity in the mythological than in the historical parts of their subject.

Deïochus of Proconnesus.

DEÏOCHUS is designated of Proconnesus by Dionysius of Halicarnassus[1]; of Cyzicus, by Stephanus Byzantinus.[2] The distinction is of little moment; the two places being near neighbours, and connected by mutual ties of colonisation and citizenship. His only recorded work, On the history of Cyzicus, in several books, appears to have been limited to the mythical annals of that place.[3] The author described

[1] De Thucyd. Jud. 5.
[2] Voce Λάμψακος: conf. Müller, ap. Didot, vol. II. p. 18.
[3] Frg. 9.

its foundation by Pelasgian fugitives from Thessaly, the quarrels between those settlers and the heroes of the Argonautic expedition on their passage through the Propontis and Euxine, with various other Argonautic adventures on that and the neighbouring coast. The work, in fact, seems to have been principally devoted to that fantastic chapter of mythical history.

Melesagoras.

MELESAGORAS, or AMELESAGORAS.—The notices of this writer[1] have a strong savour of mythology. By Dionysius of Halicarnassus he is described as a Chalcedonian; by others as an Eleusinian, and as gifted with supernatural attributes similar to those of Epimenides and Aristeas. His age and literary influence have also been strangely magnified. Clemens of Alexandria alludes to his works as the source from which many of the more distinguished prose authors of the Attic period, Anaximenes, Hecatæus, Hellanicus, Gorgias, Philochorus, derived their materials. The matter of fact on which these traditions are based seems to amount simply to this: that in the third century B.C. there existed a work entitled Atthis, attributed to an early author of this name, and which treated of the mystical mythology of Attica. It is quoted[2] relative to the popular belief that no bird of the crow species ever approached the acropolis of Athens; of the cause of which phenomenon, the author gave an elaborate explanation.

Bion of Proconnesus.

BION of Proconnesus has already been noticed as the reputed author of an abridgement of the works of Cadmus of Miletus, and as having pirated those of Melesagoras. No such abridgement of Cadmus seems to have been extant in later times; nor has the title of any other work of Bion been transmitted. There

[1] Ap. Müller in Didot, vol. II. p. 21. [2] Frg. 1.

are extant, however, several appeals to a logographer of this name, in one of which he is quoted as having described the war of Theseus and the Amazons.[1]

Of EUDEMUS of Paros the name alone has been preserved in the general notice of Dionysius of Halicarnassus already quoted.[2] Eudemus of Paros.

DEMOCLES of Phygela on the coast of Ionia, also included in the list of Dionysius, is probably the same Democles mentioned by Strabo as having treated of the volcanic phenomena of Asia minor. The name was common to several obscure writers of different periods; nor is it easy to distinguish how far its most antient proprietor is to be considered, in preference to those of later date, responsible for the few unimportant facts or opinions transmitted on the authority of "Democles."[3] Democles of Phygela.

EUGEON of Samos.—The only distinct mention of this writer is in the same list of Dionysius. Modern commentators have, however, claimed for him several citations by antient authors, where the names of the persons cited, otherwise not known to fame (Eugæon, Eugeiton), admit of being conjecturally identified with the Eugeon of Dionysius; and as the matters noticed in those citations relate to Samos, or to the neighbouring coasts of Asia, there is fair ground to assume that a single Samian author is appealed to. The title of no work by him is mentioned, and the quotations throw but little light on the nature of his researches. He is mentioned among those who made Æsop a native of Thrace rather than of Eugeon's Eugeon of Samos.

[1] Didot, op. cit. p. 19.

[2] By Clemens Alex. he appears to be called "of Naxos." Conf. Didot, p. 20.

[3] Didot, op. cit. p. 20.

own country Samos; which also possessed claims to be the birthplace of the celebrated fabulist.[1]

Simonides of Ceos, and Xenomedes of Chios.

Of the two authors who still remain for notice, SIMONIDES of Ceos and XENOMEDES of Chios, the former is described as a grandson of the celebrated poet of the same name. All that has been recorded of Xenomedes is his name and native place. Both seem to have treated solely of mythological subjects; and the citations of their text are of no interest. Suidas ascribes to Simonides a Genealogy in three books, and a work on Inventions in three books. He seems also to be quoted as author of a work entitled Miscellanies. The title of no work by Xenomedes has been recorded.[2]

---

## PART II. HISTORIANS FLOURISHING DURING THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR.

THE authors remaining for consideration in this chapter are, according to the arrangement here adopted, those who flourished during the Peloponnesian war (431—404 B.C.), as distinguished from their predecessors in the previous portion of the fifth century B.C.

The list comprises the names of Pherecydes the younger; Antiochus of Syracuse; Stesimbrotus of Thasos; Ion of Chios; Herodorus of Heraclea; Hellanicus of Lesbos; and Damastes of Sigeum.

### PHERECYDES,

Pherecydes.

10. a native of the Ionian island of Leros, settled early at Athens, where he seems to have resided the

[1] Didot, op. cit. p. 16.

[2] Didot, op. cit. p. 42. sq.

greater part of his life; hence styled sometimes a Lerian, sometimes an Athenian.[1] His flourishing epoch is placed about the middle of the fifth century B.C.[2]; so that assuming him to have been then about thirty-five, he would, if the tradition of Lucian[3] that he attained the age of eighty-five can be trusted, have survived till towards the close of that century. His age and birthplace.

The works ascribed to him were entitled: Attic Archæology; Poetical maxims; On Leros; On Iphigenia; and On the Festivals of Dionysus.[4] The existing numerous citations from his text appear all to be borrowed from his Archæology, and there is reason to doubt whether the other works, the titles of which are found only in the articles on Pherecydes in the compilation of Suidas, ever existed but in the imagination of that grammarian or of those from whom he borrowed.

The Archæology, also frequently quoted by the title of Genealogies or of Histories[5], was a work similar His Archæologia.

[1] An Athenian, by Eratosthenes, Strabo, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and other writers (ap. Didot, Fragg. Histt. Gr. vol. I. p. xxxv.; and Fragg. Pherecyd. 46. 85. 118, 119.). A Lerian by Suidas alone, whose authority is perhaps scarcely sufficient to establish his Lerian nativity.

[2] Euseb. ad Ol. 81., Chron. Pasch. p. 163.; Isidorus, Origg. I. 42.

[3] Macrobb. 22.

[4] Suid. v. Φερεκ. The three articles of Suidas, comprising the principal part of the extant details concerning "Pherecydes," are marked by the usual blundering confusion of persons and things which characterises that compilation. The distinction however between the only two authors of the name, the philosopher of Syros, and the logographer of Leros or Athens, has been so distinctly drawn by Voss, Sturz, and other writers, and so generally recognised by the modern classical public, that it will here suffice to refer the reader, who may take an interest in such questions, to the text of those commentators: Voss, de Hist. Græc. I. 1., IV. 4.; Sturz, Fragg. Pherec. p. 55. sqq., conf. C. Müller, ap. Didot, p. xxxv. sqq.; Smith, Biogr. Dict. vol. III. p. 258.

[5] Of the other titles, Theogony and Autochthones, by which it appears in whole or in part to have been occasionally designated, see Müller, ap. Didot, p. xxxvi. and in Fragg. 14. 119.; Sturz de Pherec. p. 61. sq.

to the Genealogies of Acusilaus and Hecatæus above examined, but of greater compass; and appears to have been the most complete as well as popular repertory of mythical tradition produced by the early school of logographers. It is quoted more frequently and at greater length, at almost every period of classical antiquity, than any other compilation of its class. The text, as cited by our authorities, was divided into ten books. The subjoined analysis of the citations in which individual books are referred to, will afford a general idea of the contents, and of the order in which the heads of subject were treated:

I. Of the five citations of the first book[1], one described the death of Coronis, mother of Æsculapius, and that of her lover Ischys, by the arrows of Apollo and Diana; another the settlement of Peleus at Phthia with his wife Thetis. A third traced the descent of the Athenian Miltiades from Jupiter, through Æacus, father of Peleus and Telamon. A fourth recorded the amour of Neptune with the Argolic nymph Amymone, and its progeny. In a fifth mention was made of the Arcadian city of Hysia.

II. Of the ten passages quoted from the second book[2], one described the amour of the Thessalian river god Peneus and the Argolic nymph Polydora, daughter of Danaus: two, the amour of Jove with Danaë, and the subsequent adventures of that heroine and of her son Perseus: three more refer to the intercourse between the same God and Alcmena: a seventh narrates the birth of the daughters of Thestius: an eighth the progeny of Megara by Hercules: in the ninth the eagle that preyed on the liver of Prometheus is described as offspring of Typhon and Echidna: the tenth alludes to the sanctuary of Alcmonius on the river Thermodon.

There is, however, no trace of a Theogony in the proper sense having formed part of the work of Pherecydes.

[1] Frgg. 1. 8. 13. 16. 20. (Didot.)

[2] Frgg. 21. 23. 25, 26.(2) 27.(3) 29, 30. N.B. The figures in parenthesis here indicate that several citations have been included under one head or number of the collection.

III. The single passage quoted from the third book[1], mentions the journey of Hercules with his mistress Deianeira, and his son Hyllus, from Calydon to Dryopis.

IV. The single citation of this book[2] gives, in a literal extract from the author's text, the genealogy of Belus and Agenor; of Phœnix, Nilus, Ægyptus, Danaus, and Cadmus.

V. Of the four citations from the fifth book[3], three refer to the adventures of Cadmus; the fourth to those of Protogenia, daughter of Deucalion and Pyrrha, and mother of Opus.

VI. The six citations from the sixth book[4] all refer to the Argonautic enterprise.

VII. Four citations of the seventh book[5] allude to the sequel of the same adventure; a fifth to the expedition of the seer Melampus to Phylace, to procure for his brother Bias the hand of Pero, daughter of Neleus. A sixth describes the amours of Cephalus, Procris, and Nephele.

VIII. The only citation of this book[6] relates to the Hunt of the Calydonian boar.

IX. The only citation of the ninth book[7] to the pedigree of Tænarus, name-father of the Laconian promontory.

X. In one of the four fragments of the tenth book[8] the expedition of Hercules to the gardens of the Hesperides is described. The other three allude to the lyre of Amphion, and to the fortification of Thebes by that hero and his brother Zetus, against the assault of the Phlegyans.

The decimal subdivision is here probably, as in other similar cases, the work of some later grammarian, more studious, in the arrangement of his author's text, of round numbers for the convenience of citation, than of unity or consistency in the heads of subject. The mode in which, by reference to the above citations, those heads were distributed among the several books, involves obvious incongruities of which it is not likely that an author so well skilled as Pherecydes in the art of composition would have

[1] Frg. 38. [2] Frg. 40. [3] Frg. 44.(3) 51.
[4] Frg. 54. 63. 68, 69.(2) 71. [5] Frg. 72, 73.(3) 75. 77.
[6] Frg. 81. [7] Frg. 88. [8] Frg. 33. 102.(3).

been guilty.[1] But however defective this method may be in itself, the numerical references to the books have the advantage of enabling us to form some definite notion of the order in which the author treated his materials. The preponderance of extracts relative to Thessaly from the first book, implies that he gave to that region and its primitive patriarchs the same priority awarded to them by his predecessors Acusilaus and Hecatæus. Thence he passed on to the affairs of southern Greece, commencing with the Argolis. The race of Belidæ was traced in its Argolic line of descent through Danaus and his progeny down to Hercules. The adventures of Danaë and her son Perseus were treated at much detail. Those of Hercules, commenced in the second book, were continued in the third. In the sequel the same race of Belidæ was taken up in its Syrophœnician line, Agenor, Phœnix, Cadmus. The series of Cadmeo-Bœotian legends seems to have extended over the fourth and part of the fifth book. The fragment cited from the latter, relative to Protogenia, ancestress of the Opuntian Locrians, implies that this book also

[1] Such casual citations need not, it is true, be always understood to refer to the main subject of the chapter cited; for a variety of matter might find place in the same chapter in the form of episode or digression. Some of the anomalies here in question may admit of this apology. But there are others to which it can hardly be extended. The principal subject of the sixth book was, judging from the tenor of its fragments, the Argonautic expedition; the history of which adventure usually occupied a large space in works of this nature. The narrative of it therefore, by Pherecydes, might very reasonably have extended to several subdivisions of his work, and have been continued consequently from the sixth to the seventh book. But considering how trifling a portion of the seventh book the subject so continued occupies; considering more especially the strange manner in which the division of the books is managed, Jason's adventure with the fiery bulls being placed in the close of the one, and his immediately following exploit against the dragon forming the commencement of the other, it becomes difficult to give the original author credit for so awkward an arrangement.

treated of the neighbouring districts of central Greece. The ensuing portion of the work, occupying the sixth and part of the seventh book, was devoted to the heroes of the Argonautic expedition; their history, in the system of Pherecydes, being thus separated from the main stock of Æolo-Thessalian mythology, with which it was usually connected by his fellow-logographers. Then followed the southern branch of the Cretheïdæ; Neleus, Bias, Melampus. That the Ætolian line of Æolic fable was next taken up may be gathered from an allusion to the Calydonian boar in a fragment of the eighth book. In the sequel were treated the affairs of Lacedæmon, as appears from a notice of Cape Tænarus in the ninth book. It is less easy to judge, from the citations of the tenth book, as to the subject of the concluding part of the work. The notices of Hercules and the Hesperides; of Amphion, his lyre, his brother Zetus, and the walls of Thebes; have more the appearance of supplements to previous portions of the author's text, than of the winding up of his work. The number of passages cited as belonging to individual books amounts to about forty. The whole number of citations in the collection is about 180. There remain therefore 140 the position of which, in the original work, can only be conjectured from the relation in which they stand to the other forty. Modern commentators have attempted, with partial success, by an adjustment of these numerous texts of undefined position on the framework supplied by the forty, still further to restore the plan of the original work.[1]

His system of mythology.

11. Pherecydes seems, like Hecatæus, to have confined his purely divine genealogy to what was required

[1] C. Müller, Fragg. Pherec. ap. Didot, vol. I.

as introductory to his lines of mortal heroes, but to have treated the human branch of his subject in copious detail. In the selection of his materials there are however traces of a partiality for certain regions. The notices in the fragments are limited to the principal districts of Greece proper, with an occasional excursion to certain of her colonies. The remoter parts of Hellas, comprising many countries of high celebrity in other mythological systems, appear to have been neglected. Such are, to the north-west, Epirus, with Molossia and Dodona; Acarnania, with the Cephallenian islands: and, to the east and south, the important islands of Eubœa and Crete. Among the countries preferred, the smallest share of attention, still judging from the fragments, has been bestowed on Attica. The whole number relating to that region or its heroes is about twelve, or a fifteenth part of the entire collection. Those relative to each of the neighbouring districts, Bœotia and Argolis, amount to double that number. Those devoted to Thessalian affairs, inclusive of the Argonautic expedition, are the most numerous of all. The restriction in the case of Attica is in itself reasonable; that country being certainly the one of all Greece, which, in proportion to its subsequent historical celebrity, makes the least figure in the genuine heroic mythology. But this consideration could hardly be expected to weigh with Pherecydes, a historian settled at Athens, writing so entirely under the influence of Attic associations as to have acquired the surname of "Athenian," and flourishing at a period when the Attic dramatists were rapidly procuring for their own book of local tradition a wide sphere of national popularity. The little attention bestowed by him on Athenian mytho-

logy seems more especially difficult to reconcile with the title of Attic applied by the antient grammarians[1] to his Archæologia. Equally remarkable is his rejection, in several instances, of those versions of heroic legends which were specially countenanced by Athenian poets. In the Theban cycle of mythology, the tradition which made Eteocles and Polynices the incestuous offspring of Œdipus and Jocasta, forms with the Attic dramatists an essential link of that tragic series of family vicissitudes: Pherecydes preferred the account of Homer, who described the sons of Œdipus as his legitimate children by Eurygania, whom he married after the death of Jocasta[2]; and makes him continue to reign at Thebes, as the husband of a third wife, after the death of Eurygania; to the exclusion of the Sophoclean story of his refuge and death in the Attic sanctuary of the Eumenides. The account given by Pherecydes of the delivery of Orestes from his mother's furies, seems also to have differed from that popular with the Attic poets.[3]

Although both the title and the remains of the Archæologia imply it to have been essentially a mythical compilation, its materials were not exclusively restricted to mythical subjects; and it is worthy of remark that the few notices of historical events in the citations refer to the history of Attica, or to that of the colonies founded under Attic auspices. One alludes to the death of Codrus. Another contains an account of the foundation of Miletus, Ephesus, and other neighbouring cities, by Androclus son of Codrus and his fellow-adventurers; and of the previous state

[1] Suidas, v. Φερεκ.: conf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. I. 13. frg. 85.
[2] Frg. 48. [3] Frg. 97.

of that district of Asia under its aboriginal inhabitants the Carians and Leleges.[1] In a third passage[2] the author traced back the pedigree of Miltiades, through the line of Æacidæ, to Jupiter.[3] This honourable exception in favour of the real history of Athens would go far to compensate for the neglect of her mythology; and might possibly, had we a clearer insight into the plan of the work, supply a better explanation of its title of "Attic" than any that now suggests itself.

The merits of this composition appear to have consisted partly in the copiousness of its materials, partly, if we may use such an expression in such a case, in the practical manner in which they were treated. Of those trivial etymologies, and subtle attempts at allegorical exposition, in which his fellow-logographers were so fond of indulging, little or no trace occurs in the remains of Pherecydes. Nor does he seem to have affected peculiarity or novelty in the choice or working up of his legends; but, as a general rule, to have preferred the standard versions of national tradition authorised by Homer, Hesiod, and its other primitive organs, to those which the subtle genius of the more recent mythology placed at his disposal.[4]

[1] Frg. 110, 111. [2] Frg. 20.

[3] The popular anecdote concerning Idanthyrsus the Scythian and the emperor Darius (frg. 113.), quoted by Clemens from Pherecydes of Syros, has also been conjectured by Sturz and others to be borrowed from the historian rather than the philosopher. (Müll. ad frg. 113.)

[4] Were frg. 94. to be understood in its literal sense, it would supply a remarkable, and somewhat absurd exception to the above rule. Anius king of Delos is there said to have persuaded the Greeks, on their way to attack Troy, to remain nine years in his port; on the assurance, afterwards made good by the event, that they would succeed in sacking the city on the tenth year. The passage has usually, but not perhaps legitimately, been interpreted as implying that Anius had merely attempted to persuade them.

His style.

The transmission of a number of apparently literal extracts from the Archæologia[1] enables us to form some estimate of the literary style of Pherecydes, which is characterised, though less broadly than that of some preceding logographers, by the sententious simplicity of the early school of prose composition. The primitive Ionian mannerism is also observable in a tendency to poetical or even metrical turns of expression.

Pherecydes, though a naturalised Athenian, composed in the Ionic dialect[2], preferred in his day as the language of historical composition by the natives of every part of Greece. Ionic idioms, accordingly, are not wanting in some of the fragments. In others the forms of the Attic or common Greek dialect are alone observable. These may possibly have been introduced by transcribers or quoters during the passage of the text to posterity. It was, however, also natural that Pherecydes, writing in Athens at a time when Attic prose was beginning to enjoy the benefit of literary culture, should modify his native Ionic by Attic dialectical usage.

Upon the whole the remains of this author justify the popularity which he enjoyed with his countrymen as a standard in his own branch of literature, which there is the more cause to regret should have been one of so unprofitable a nature. His work appears to have survived to the lowest period of classical antiquity, being habitually quoted during the Byzantine age; nor, in the numerous citations of him by authors of every period, is there any expression of

[1] Frgg. 29. 33h. 44. 48. 60. 76. 85.

[2] Frgg. 44. 75. 85.: conf. Chœrob. in Bekk. Anecd. Gr. p. 1196.

doubt as to the genuine character of the book to which they refer.

## ANTIOCHUS OF SYRACUSE.

Antiochus of Syracuse.

12. Although this author does not appear to have enjoyed any great share of general popularity with the native public, his remains and the few notices concerning him[1] entitle him, if judged rather by the practical value of his labours than by his skill in the art of expounding mythical genealogies, to rank, with the impartial critic, among the most sensible and judicious writers of his age and class. He has accordingly, by some of the later more diligent investigators of national history and geography, Strabo for example, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, been cited with greater respect than many of his more celebrated contemporaries, as a standard authority on the subjects to which his researches appear to have been confined.

Of his personal history nothing more has been recorded than that he was a native of Syracuse, and that his father's name was Xenophanes.[2] He is described by the more trustworthy authorities as flourishing during the Peloponnesian war; and certainly survived the year 423 B.C.; his Sicilian history having extended down to that year, the eighth of the war, and the first of the reign of Darius Nothus.[3] As neither this event, nor any other of the same date, can be considered of sufficient importance to have furnished an appropriate conclusion to a historical work, it might seem a reasonable inference that

[1] Ap. Didot, vol. I. p. xlv. 181.
[2] Pausanias, Dionys. Hal. alii, in frgg. 1. seq.
[3] Diod. XII. 71.: conf. Clint. F. H. vol. II. p. 315.

the progress of his labours, after reaching that stage, had been interrupted by death or some other accidental impediment. No allusion, however, occurs to the Sicilian history as having been left in an unfinished state.

The researches of Antiochus were limited to the affairs of his native island of Sicily, and of the opposite shores of Italy. Two works alone are ascribed to him: the Sicilian history already mentioned, and one entitled Italian Origines. The former is stated to have comprised nine books. There is no notice of any similar arrangement of the contents of his work on Italy; but the greater part of the extant citations, fifteen in number, are from its text; while but two or three references to the Sicilian history have been preserved. This disparity may be owing to the circumstance, that while the history of Sicily was amply treated during the classical period by other authors of greater celebrity and popularity than Antiochus, comparatively few writers of note, during the same period, had devoted themselves with similar zeal to the affairs of Italy. The later compilers therefore, such as Strabo and Diodorus, were naturally led to give a preference to the standard Sicilian historians Philistus and Timæus as their chief authorities on the one branch of subject; while recognising the claims of Antiochus to prior attention in respect to the other.

The scanty remains of the Sicilian history afford but little insight into either its plan or details. One fragment describes the ejection of the Siculi, an aboriginal Italian race, from their native continental seats, by the rival tribes of Œnotri and Opici, and their migration across the Rhegian strait to the island

since called after them.[1] Another treats of the Cnidian colonies on the Æolian or Lipari islets.[2] The more numerous fragments of the Italica, while supplying a copious body of information relative to the cities and states of Italy, also show that the author's subject was limited chiefly to the Hellenic colonies in the southern portion of that peninsula, from whom it derived in after ages its familiar name of Magna Græcia. Rome, however, was mentioned; for the first time probably, by a Greek author. This interesting passage is quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus[3], as an attestation by so "antient and respectable a historian," to the fact, that in the primitive Italian tradition Rome was not represented as having been founded by Æneas, but as having existed prior to the epoch of his landing on the coast of Latium. Of this primeval Rome, Siculus, the eponyme patriarch of Sicily, was, in the same tradition, described as a native. The notices contained in the citations of the Italica, relative to the more strictly historical epochs of Italiote history, appear to indicate both diligent research and critical judgement; and the author's geographical definitions and descriptions are quoted with the same deference and respect by Strabo[4], as his historical notices by Dionysius and other competent judges. The few existing lines of literal extract[5] from the text of Antiochus afford no satisfactory data for judging of his style.

His notice of Rome.

The authors who form the subject of the two following notices, Stesimbrotus of Thasos and Ion of

[1] Frg. 1. [2] Frg. 2. [3] Frg. 7.: conf. Syncell. p. 193. D.
[4] Frgg. 8—14. [5] Frgg. 3—7.

Chios, could hardly, perhaps, in any general estimate of their literary character, be properly classed as historians. The reputation of Stesimbrotus rests chiefly on his qualifications as a rhapsodist and Homeric commentator; while Ion is celebrated less as a prose writer than as a tragic poet, in which latter capacity he ranks second only to the three great masters of the Attic drama. Both, however, were historical writers, and although their popularity with the antient public may have been mainly dependent on other branches of literature, they possess, in their historical character, equal, perhaps superior claims on the attention of the modern critic. Stesimbrotus, a professional Homerid, seems to have done little to raise the critical art from the state of infancy in which he found it[1]; while Ion, in spite of his popularity with his own less fastidious contemporaries, is described, on high authority, as having done more to deteriorate, than to maintain the national taste in dramatic composition.[2] Both writers, on the other hand, can boast of having carried, simultaneously it would appear, the art of historical composition an important step in advance; as the first recorded cultivators of those useful and agreeable branches of that art which may be comprised under the head of Popular biography and Historical memoirs. While on these grounds they possess an immediate claim on our attention, our present notice will comprise, along with the few particulars of their lives which have been preserved, the consideration of their historical writings alone. Any remarks on their labours in other departments of composition will be reserved

[1] See frg. 18., ap. Didot, vol. II. p. 58. [2] Longin. 33.

for the portion of our own work specially devoted to those departments.

## STESIMBROTUS

Stesimbrotus of Thasos.

13. was a native of Thasos, an island colonised about two centuries before his own birth from Paros, under the auspices of the poet Archilochus. As Paros was originally an Ionian settlement, and as there is no reason to doubt that her Thasian daughter had retained the dialect of the parent state during the interval between Archilochus and Stesimbrotus, the latter may also rank as an Ionian author. He appears, however, to have early settled at Athens, where he is described as having opened a school[1] and taught for hire. We are not informed what other branches of knowledge his instructions comprehended besides his own peculiar department of Homeric interpretation; and as the only one of his scholars whose name has been preserved, Antimachus of Colophon[2], was an epic poet, and editor of Homer, Stesimbrotus himself may be best characterised as a professor of literary criticism. He is also the first recorded public instructor in that science; although it is probable that it had been previously taught by his fellow "rhapsodists." The notice that Stesimbrotus was the instructor of Antimachus who was contemporaneous with Plato, and the biographer of Pericles who died in 429 B.C., marks out the latter half of the fifth century as his own flourishing period. There can be little doubt, from the terms in which he is cited as an authority on Homeric questions[3], that

[1] Xenoph. Symp. III. [2] Suid. v. Ἀντίμ. [3] Frg. 18.

his critical labours had been committed to writing. But neither title nor description of any work by him on such subjects has survived. A tract by him On the mysteries, is also occasionally quoted by extant classics.[1]

His memoirs of Attic statesmen.

The work however to which attention is here more immediately called, is that entitled Memoirs of Themistocles, Thucydides (son of Melesias), and Pericles.[2] No notice has been preserved of the precise plan of this miscellany: whether it treated of each statesman under a separate head; or of the three conjointly, as contemporaneous, and all engaged as party leaders in the arena of Athenian politics. The earliest author who quotes it is Plutarch; a circumstance adduced by modern commentators as an argument that it was little esteemed in the flourishing age of Greek literature.[3] This argument, however, is fallacious. It was not, as will be further shown hereafter, the custom with the historians of the classical period to quote prior authorities by name; and the partial exceptions to the rule tend but to confirm it. Herodotus, throughout his nine books, mentions Hecatæus alone among the many writers who had previously treated in whole or in part his own wide range of subjects; and him he mentions, not in the ordinary way of citing a previous testimony, but with the view of satirising or confuting a rival historian. Thucydides mentions Hellanicus alone; and in a similarly incidental manner. Nor probably were the authors of such familiar memoirs and anecdotes admitted by the earlier professional historians to the same rank of valid historical testimony as the more regular mem-

[1] Frg. 13. sq.

[2] Athen. XIII. p. 589.

[3] C. Müller in Fragg. p. 53.

bers of their own body. In support of this view it may be added that Ion, another favourite author of Plutarch in the same branch of literature as Stesimbrotus, is as little cited as Stesimbrotus by any historian prior to Plutarch. So that any argument derivable from the silence of Plutarch would be equally valid against Ion as against Stesimbrotus; but it may safely be pronounced to be of as little real value in the one as in the other case.

Stesimbrotus appears to have been a severe judge of those whose characters form the subject of his memoirs; and Plutarch accuses him of being too ready to promulgate calumnious imputations against them.[1] This remark however is made with special reference to Pericles, of whom Plutarch is, there can be little doubt, an over-indulgent biographer. Nor does there appear any real ground for the charge of undue favour to the opponents of Pericles, which has been brought against Stesimbrotus by modern commentators. Judging from the existing citations of his work, he dealt both his approbation and his censure with unsparing impartiality.

We possess eleven authenticated appeals to his text, ten of which are by Plutarch, in his lives of Themistocles, Cimon, and Pericles. It is remarkable that five of these passages contained special notice of the conduct or character of Cimon, whose name does not appear in the title of the work; while in not one of the whole number is mention made of Thucydides, who figures in that title, with Themistocles and Pericles, as the third member of the triumvirate. This naturally leads to the suspicion, that the title itself, in the passage of Athenæus where alone it is men-

[1] Frgg. 9, 10, 11, &c.

tioned, may have been carelessly quoted by that author, or may have been corrupted by his transcribers, and that it either originally contained all four names, or that the name of Thucydides has been substituted for that of Cimon. Of Pericles the extant citations contain seven notices; of Themistocles but two. The account of the latter statesman's flight to the court of the Molossian king[1] Admetus, corresponds generally with that given by (the historian) Thucydides. It contains however this addition: that Themistocles, before finally settling in Persia, sought an asylum with Hieron king of Syracuse, whose daughter he asked in marriage, and to whom he proposed a scheme for the conquest of Greece; both which overtures were rejected by the Sicilian prince. This supplementary anecdote is made light of by Plutarch, as being both unauthenticated and improbable. In the same passage Cimon is stated to have persecuted, and finally caused to be put to death, Epicrates, the friend of Themistocles, by whose good offices the wife and family of the latter had been enabled to escape from Athens and join him at the court of Admetus. This was an act certainly by no means creditable to the rival party leader; and the prominence given to it by Stesimbrotus, the only author cited by Plutarch as having mentioned it, suffices in itself to vindicate him from all suspicion of undue favouritism towards Cimon.

His character of Cimon.

Stesimbrotus describes Cimon as devoid of that polite culture on which the Athenian citizen of rank usually prided himself, and especially as ignorant of the art of music; in which other contemporary authorities represent him as not unskilled.[2] He commends

[1] Frg. 2.

[2] Frg. 3.

him at the same time for his freedom from the foppery and conceit with which the elegant accomplishments of his fellow-countrymen were apt to be accompanied, and for a dignified plainness of manner and speech. But he further describes him as carrying this latter peculiarity the length of an enthusiastic, and in an Athenian offensive, emulation of the other extreme of rudeness exhibited in the Spartan manners. Of this failing several illustrations are quoted from Stesimbrotus by Plutarch.[1]

and of Pericles.

The character of Pericles, as sketched out in the same fragmentary manner, presents a similar mixture of good and evil. The imputed licentiousness of his moral habits, especially in his intercourse with women, which, as Plutarch informs us, supplied the comic dramatists with abundant materials for scurrilous attack, was also enlarged on by Stesimbrotus.[2] Plutarch denounces these charges as false and malignant; but Athenæus[3] seems to admit them as valid, partly on the authority of Stesimbrotus. Nor is it likely that they were altogether groundless. The comic writers seldom raised their calumnies on a purely imaginary basis. But on the other hand Stesimbrotus narrates, in a very effective manner, an act of Pericles highly creditable both to his generosity and humanity.[4] When Cimon was publicly arraigned of treason after his Thasian campaign in 463, it devolved on Pericles, as head of the opposite party, to appear as chief prosecutor. Shortly before the trial Elpinice the wife of Cimon, a female not then in the bloom of youth, obtained an interview with Pericles, and besought him to deal mercifully

[1] Frgg. 3, 4, 5, 6.
[2] Frgg. 9. sqq.
[3] XIII. p. 589.
[4] Frg. 4.

with her husband. Pericles replied jocosely: that she was too old a woman to act the part of suppliant with due effect.[1] But on the day of the trial he abstained from all active proceedings in the court; simply rising in his place, according to form, as principal accuser; and Cimon was acquitted. Stesimbrotus also noticed in terms of eulogy the funeral oration pronounced by Pericles on the Athenians who fell in the Samian war of 441 B.C.; illustrating his remarks by the citation of an eloquent passage.[2]

In various other places Plutarch cites this author's testimony relative to events described in the ordinary course of his own narrative; more frequently in the way of confutation than of approbation; but in several instances his grounds of objection are so inadequate[3] as to warrant the belief that he was hardly a fair judge of the Thasian biographer's merits. The frequency of his appeals to the work, on the other hand, with his sedulous anxiety to controvert or rectify its statements, proves that he considered its author as no contemptible adversary. From the passages above quoted and examined it may be collected, that the method of historical illustration followed by Stesimbrotus was much of the same kind as that prevalent to this day among writers of Memoirs; and which may be considered as in some degree inherent in the genius of that order of composition. Without perhaps any deliberate intention to falsify or misrepresent, he was anxious to impart spirit to his narrative by novel facts and striking

[1] Athenæus (XIII. p. 589.) gives a different, and very scandalous account of this interview: μισθὸν ἔλαβε . . . . τὸ τῇ Ἐλπινίκῃ μιχθῆναι.

[2] Frg. 8.

[3] Frg. 1.: conf. C. Müll. ad loc.

anecdotes; and not over rigid in testing the truth of those with which public rumour or private gossip supplied him.

As no literal extracts of any length from the text of this or of any other work of Stesimbrotus have been preserved, we have no sufficient means of judging either of his style, or of the form of dialect in which he composed.

## ION OF CHIOS.

Ion of Chios

14. Ion, distinguished in a greater or less degree as poet, historian, and philosopher[1], was a native of Chios, and son of a certain Orthomenes familiarly nicknamed Xuthus[2], after the father of the mythical patriarch Ion. In early youth he was brought to Athens, and introduced to the leading circles of that polite metropolis. Adopting its literary tastes, he rose to high distinction as a dramatic poet, and appears to have been a habitual visitor in the city during the subsequent course of his life; without however abandoning his Ionian nationality, or his more permanent domicile in his native island. He describes himself[3], when a youth of tender years, on his first visit it may be presumed to Athens, as having supped at the house of a citizen named Laomedon. Among other guests present was the celebrated Cimon, who entertained the company with an account of the stratagem by which, at Byzantium,

[1] Didot, Fragg. Hist. Gr. vol. II. p. 44. sqq.: conf. Bentley, Epist. ad Mill. ed. Lips. p. 494. sqq.

[2] Suid. et Harpocr. v. Ἴων; Schol. ad Aristoph. Pac. 835.

[3] Frg. 4.

about the year 470 B.C.[1], he secured for the Athenians a better share in the division of the spoil captured in the previous campaign, than fell to the lot of their confederates. Assuming the banquet to have taken place four or five years after the stratagem, about the year 465 B.C., and Ion to have been at the time seventeen or eighteen years of age, his birth would fall between 485 and 480. His intimacy with Æschylus, of which notice has been preserved, must also have been formed at an early period of life; as that poet died in 456. Ion is described as having been present with Æschylus at the Isthmian games during the combat of the cestus; on which occasion a severe wound received by one of the combatants led the dramatist to address to his youthful companion a moral reflexion which Plutarch, who quotes it, estimates more highly than it deserves.[2]

Ion's first appearance on the Attic stage was in Ol. 82, between 452 and 449 B.C.[3] In 441 he was resident at Chios, where he was a fellow-guest with Sophocles, then commanding an Athenian squadron on the coast of Asia, at the house of Hermesilas, a private friend of Sophocles, and who filled the office of Proxenus or Public patron of the Athenian state in Chios. In 429 he may be presumed to have again visited Athens, having in that year competed with Euripides and Iophon for the tragic prize. His death took place before 421, if weight can attach to the literal import of a passage of the Peace of Aristo-

[1] So Müller, ap. Didot, loc. cit. But see Grote on the uncertain chronology of these events. (Hist. of Gr. vol. v. p. 394. sqq.) Mr. Grote does not notice this division of spoil at Byzantium.

[2] De Prof. in Virt. (frg. 4.).

[3] Schol. Aristoph. Pax, 835.; Suid. v. Ἴων.

phanes. Not long prior to that date, Ion had produced an ode beginning with the words "Morning star." In the drama of Aristophanes above mentioned[1], the slave of Trygæus asks his master, whether it is true, as some said, "that men after their death became stars;" and on being answered in the affirmative, he further inquires "what new star of note had lately been observed." To which Trygæus replies: "Ion of Chios; the same who composed the Morning star upon earth, was himself hailed by the title of Morning star, on passing from this to the other world." It may however be a question whether these verses necessarily refer to the physical death of the poet; or may not rather, in the spirit of Athenian comic humour, allude to his poetical death; to his having withdrawn perhaps from the Attic world of literary composition after his publication of the "Morning star;" either from mortification at the cold reception of that poem, or from some other cause of a similar nature.

In his poetical capacity, Ion is described as a singularly prolific genius, having composed Tragedies, Comedies, Dithyrambs, Epigrams, Pæans, Hymns, Scolia, Encomia, Elegies.[2] As a philosopher, his principal or only work was entitled Triagmoi or Triads.[3] It was in prose, and a commentary, as its name denotes, on the mystical number Three; a favourite subject of speculation in those days with philosophers of higher celebrity than Ion. To

[1] Pax, 835.

[2] Schol. Aristoph. sup. cit.; Suid. and Harpocrat. v. Ἴων.

[3] Harpocrat. v. Ἴων. Possibly the same work called Cosmologicus by the Schol. Aristoph. (conf. Müll. ad frg. 12.), and Περὶ Μετεώρων by Suidas. Callimachus assigned it to a different author. Harpocr. loc. cit.

these various compositions in poetry or prose, their due share of notice will be allotted in the proper place. His historical works, to which alone our attention is now called, were enumerated under the five following titles: Hypomnemata, or Memoirs; Epidemiæ, or Foreign visits; Synecdemeticus, or the Fellow-traveller; Logos Presbeuticus, or Diplomatic memoirs; and Chii-ctisis, or the Foundation of Chios.[1] The first of the five was probably a common title, comprising the subjects numbered under the three next. Of the Foreign visits it has been doubted whether they are to be understood of visits paid by Ion himself to foreign cities, or of visits paid by distinguished foreigners to Chios. The latter view is the more probable; as the next title in the list, that of Fellow-traveller, seems more appropriately to characterise the foreign visits of the former class.[2] The precise nature of the work, the title of which has here been rendered Diplomatic memoirs, is doubtful. The phrase in the original denotes Narrative of an embassy or embassies; but of what embassy or embassies we have no means of judging. The genuine character of the book was also questioned by the antient critics.[3] The Foundation of Chios seems to have been of the purely logographic or mythological order.

His prose works.

Of the passages cited from the properly historical

[1] Schol. Aristoph.; Suid.; Harpocr. sup. loc. cit. Athenæus and J. Poll. ap. Did. frgg. 1. 10.

[2] Conf. Bentl. ad Mill., ed. Lips. p. 507.

[3] Schol. Aristoph. loc. cit. The passage of Sext. Empiricus, supposed by C. Müller (frg. 11.) to be derived from this work, is a garbled version of a familiar anecdote in Herodotus (III. 46.); a fact of which it seems surprising neither Müller, nor the other commentators whom he quotes, should have been aware. The word μέσων in the fragment is probably a corruption of Μιλησίων; possibly of Σαμίων.

or biographical works of Ion, there are but seven which can in themselves be considered as containing historical matter. The notices contained in five of these seven relate to the affairs of Thucydides (son of Melesias), Cimon, and Pericles; especially of the two last-mentioned statesmen; the same, it will be observed, celebrated by Stesimbrotus. The passages concerning them have here also been chiefly transmitted by Plutarch. The remaining two citations relate to Sophocles and Socrates. Ion, like Stesimbrotus, is a censorious judge of the character of Pericles. He is accordingly, like his fellow-biographer, reprimanded for his boldness by the evidently partial Bœotian writer, who is yet obliged to admit that the failings stigmatised by Ion had not escaped the notice of other contemporaneous authorities. Ion dwells[1] on the illustrious demagogue's haughty demeanour, on his proud consciousness of his own great qualities combined with supercilious contempt for the merits of others; and on his tendency to indulge in vainglorious vaunts of his mighty deeds. He is described, after his reduction of Samos, and renewed exaction of allegiance from the other states of Asia minor, as contrasting his exploits with those of Agamemnon of old[2], "who had taken ten whole years to conquer a single city of Phrygia, while he, in the short space of nine months, had brought to submission the most powerful states of Ionia and Æolia." Of Cimon, on the other hand, Ion shows himself an ardent admirer[3], and is in so far consequently more open than Stesimbrotus to the charge of partiality in his estimate of rival Athenian statesmen. He even

His character of Pericles,

and of Cimon.

[1] Frg. 5. [2] Frg. 8. [3] Frgg. 4. sqq.

gives Cimon credit for agreeable qualities the possession of which was denied him by Stesimbrotus; he praises the manly grace of his person, and contrasts the unpretending simplicity and affability of his manners with the supercilious pomp of Pericles.

15. The passage relative to Socrates is of little value, but that concerning Sophocles[1] is one of the most interesting, as it is the longest, of the fragmentary remains of Greek historical literature prior to Herodotus. It describes a characteristic scene at a banquet given, by a friend and fellow-citizen of Ion, to the poet in illustration of whose character the narrative is introduced. The following version of part of a dialogue between the poet and another literary guest on the occasion, will convey a fair general impression of the character of the work from which it is derived: His style.

"Observing the youth who acted as our cupbearer standing on the hearth, the red beams of the fire playing on his cheek, Sophocles thus addressed him: 'Art thou willing, my fair boy, to serve me with wine in the mode in which I may drink of it most pleasantly?' and on the lad expressing ready obedience to his commands, 'Then,' continued the poet, 'carry thy cup gently with thine own hand to my lips, and again as gently remove it.' As the blush on the youth's countenance at this assumed a deeper hue, 'How finely," said Sophocles, turning to his fellow-guests, 'has it been said by the poet Phrynichus:

The light of love beams on his purple cheek.'

Upon which Eretrieus, the schoolmaster of Erythræ, remarked: 'Skilled as thou art thyself, Sophocles, in the composition of poetry, thou hast yet judged wrong in commending Phrynichus for applying the epithet purple to the cheek of a fair boy; for were the cheeks of this our cupbearer to be overspread by a painter's brush with a shade of purple, he would no longer appear the handsome

[1] Frg. 1.

youth which he is. One cannot therefore with propriety illustrate a beautiful object by comparing it with another which is not beautiful.' To this the poet replied with a good-humoured smile: 'If so, my friend and fellow-guest, then must that other line of Simonides, so greatly esteemed by the rest of the Hellenic public, be distasteful to thee alone:

Sweetly the maid spoke from her purple lips.

As little could you bear with Homer when he talks of the golden locks of Apollo; for were a painter, in a picture of the god, in good earnest to tinge his locks with gold, instead of the dark shade natural to hair, he would produce but a sorry work of art. Equally offensive to you must be the Poet's epithet of rosy-fingered; for were a hand really to be dipped in a dye of rose colour, it would be more like that of a journeyman dyer than of a fair woman.' This reply, while it silenced the schoolmaster, afforded much entertainment to the rest of the company."[1]

This extract, with the whole context to which it belongs, possesses strong claims on the interest of the modern reader. While a characteristic specimen, both of the style of Ion and of the genius at large of this order of literary composition in his time, it presents a graphic sketch of the habits and humours of the more intellectual order of Greek convivial society in the Periclean age. The criticism is lively and ingenious, the repartee spirited, without bitterness or personality. Both sentiment and phraseology are elegant, while free from affectation or studied figures of speech. The structure is natural and perspicuous, equally removed from the sententious meagreness of the old Ionian school, and from the complicated rotundity of the Siculo-Attic period. Judging therefore from the above specimen, it may be presumed that this branch of composition had hitherto remained exempt from the subtleties or mere-

[1] See Appendix F.

tricious graces of the Gorgian school. It was scarcely indeed to be expected that such familiar narratives, consisting in great part of anecdote and convivial conversation, should readily submit to the artificial rules which had been imposed on oratory and didactic composition.

The passage above illustrated contains many traces of the Ionic dialect.[1] They are however but traces; the general form of expression being Attic. The broader features of Ionism may here as in other similar cases have been effaced in the transmission of the passage to posterity; or possibly Ion may have tempered his native usage, by the infusion of a certain amount of that Attic precision which was certainly better adapted to this style of composition than the sonorous rotundity of the pure Ionic dialect. This would the more naturally happen in the case of one who, if we may trust our extant authorities, was in the habit of composing not only tragedies but comedies for the Attic stage.

Of the remaining citations from the historical memoirs of Ion, several[2], referring to matters of gastronomic or convivial interest, throw further light on the social character of the age and of the author, who is indeed celebrated by his antient commentators as a devotee both of Venus and Bacchus.[3] His other historical work, entitled Foundation of Chios, seems to have been modelled altogether on the old logographic plan of mythological research; and to have been marked by no features of interest beyond its fellows. The fragments[4] refer exclusively to the

[1] Conf. Bentl. ad Mill. ed. Lips. p. 507.
[2] Frgg. 2, 3.
[3] Baton Sinop. ap. Athen. x. p. 436. E.
[4] 13, 14, 15.

mythical legends of the island; to its discovery as yet in a barren state by Neptune; to the amours of that god with its indigenous nymph; to the fall of snow (chion) which took place at the birth of their son, hence called Chion, and the island after him Chios. From his descendants, and from those of one or two other equally mythical settlers from Caria and Crete, the names of the principal localities of the island are derived by a like course of etymological trifling. An allusion in one of the fragments to the hero Palamedes, would indicate that the destinies of Chios were brought into some kind of connexion with the Trojan war. That the realities of her Foundation, or in other words of her Greek colonisation, formed no part of the author's plan, seems to be implied by the statement of Pausanias[1], that although Ion had alluded to the connexion of Chios with the Ionian league, he had omitted all notice of the causes which led to that connexion.

### HERODORUS OF HERACLEA.

Herodorus of Heraclea.

16. Heraclea, the native place of this author, was a city of Bithynia on the south coast of the Euxine sea. He is hence variously designated Herodorus Heracleotes and Herodorus Ponticus. Heraclea was founded by a mixed body of Bœotian and Megarian colonists, under Milesian auspices[2], at an uncertain period; but like many similar settlements claimed a mythical as well as a historical origin[3]; the former being connected by native annalists, as was natural, with

[1] Frg. 13.

[2] Frg. 57.; Ephor. ap. Schol. Apoll. Rh. II. 845. (frg. Eph. 83. Did.); Pausan. v. xxvi. 6., conf. Strab. XII. p. 542.

[3] Mela, I. 19.

the adventures of the hero from whom the place derived its name. Of the personal history of Herodorus nothing further is recorded than that he was father of a disciple of Socrates named Bryson, who himself afterwards enjoyed some celebrity as a philosopher and man of letters.[1] This notice regarding the son establishes with sufficient general accuracy the age of the father, as contemporaneous with Socrates during the latter part of the fifth century B.C.

The historical researches of Herodorus were confined to the mythical age; and the chief peculiarity of his literary character is the marked manner in which his antiquarian sympathies are concentrated around his native town of Heraclea; a place enjoying but a slender share of real celebrity, and which it required some effort of ingenuity to glorify even by the reflected splendour of other more renowned scenes of action. His principal works were a Life or History of Hercules, and an Argonautica, or history of the Argonautic enterprise. The district around Heraclea was the scene of one of the twelve leading exploits of the Theban hero; and the principal theatre of the Argonautic adventure was the same line of coast, Heraclea itself having been signalised by sundry subordinate incidents of the expedition. Herodorus has accordingly been at pains in each case to give prominence to those details which conferred honour on his native place.

His life of Hercules.

The work on Hercules appears to have treated its comprehensive subject, the genealogy, birth, adventures, character, death, and divine honours of the Theban hero, in very ample detail, and to have been

[1] Aristot. ap. C. Müller, in Didot, Fragg. vol. II. p. 27.

of considerable bulk. In one of the citations mention occurs of the seventeenth book[1]; from which it were reasonable to infer that the whole work may have contained not less than the round number of twenty. The notices of the Argonautica make no mention of any division into books. This would imply it to have been a less voluminous composition than the Life of Hercules; but the citations of its text are nearly equal in number to those of the sister work, and their tenor also indicates that it treated its subject in similar detail. The Argonautic expedition, as a single adventure, would less readily suggest any minute subdivision of parts, than the twelve labours of the Theban hero with his numerous supplementary exploits.

The portion of the Life of Hercules which connected itself most closely with Heraclea was what is classed as his ninth labour, his expedition against the Amazon queen Hippolyta. Upon this occasion the hero, in his passage through Bithynia, conferred on Lycus, a king of that region to whom he had been indebted for friendly services, a large additional territory wrested from another neighbouring hostile potentate. This territory the new proprietor, in grateful remembrance of the donor, named Heraclea.[2] The city itself was not founded until a later period; when the site selected, in terms of a divine injunction, was that marked by the grave of Idmon, the prophet of the Argonauts[3], who died during their visit to that coast, and was buried on its soil. The city was built around his tomb, which was shown in later times in the centre of the agora. Although the affairs of the Argonauts

[1] Frg. 31. [2] Frg. 15. [3] Frg. 57.

were thus connected by Herodorus with those of his favourite hero Hercules, the same hero was yet excluded by him[1] from the share in the Argonautic adventure usually allotted to him in the popular legend; obviously because it was not consistent with his dignity that he should act a secondary part in any great achievement; and his participation in the Colchian enterprise would necessarily have placed him in a secondary position as compared with Jason. Herodorus also denied to Theseus, not only the office of coadjutor of Hercules in his principal undertakings, an honour assigned to the Attic hero in the popular Attic fable; but even appears to have disputed his title to the celebrity which he there enjoyed as a performer of mighty deeds in the same independant capacity as Hercules.[2] Among other instances of preference given by Herodorus to his native region as the scene of Herculean enterprise, he described[3] the infernal dog Cerberus as having been dragged from Hades to the upper world, at a place called Acherusia, in the neighbourhood of Heraclea; the same adventure being placed in other accounts at Cape Tænarus in Laconia, or at Trœzene in Argolis.

His Argonautica.

In his narrative of the Argonautic expedition, Herodorus gave, as we have seen, special prominence to the death of Idmon the soothsayer at Heraclea.[4] He also further consulted the honour of his native place by describing the Argo on her voyage homeward as following the same course, by Heraclea consequently, which she had taken when outward bound, and as having retouched at that port; on which occasion, and not on her first visit as in other accounts, both

[1] Frgg. 27. 38.
[2] Frgg. 16, 17. 34.
[3] Frg. 25.
[4] Frgg. 56. sqq.

Idmon the seer and Tiphys the pilot passed to the other world.[1] In the appointment of Erginus, a primitive Milesian hero, as successor to the vacant office of Tiphys, Herodorus seems to have paid an episodical compliment[2] to Miletus, the foundress or patroness of most of the Greek colonial settlements on that line of coast.

His composition and style.

Apart from these and similar other details reflecting the literary patriotism of Herodorus, the treatment of neither of his subjects seems to have been distinguished by much either of novelty or ingenuity. That both works, however, enjoyed an extensive credit in their own department of mythical research, is evinced by the large number, in all upwards of seventy extant citations of their text. This may be owing partly to his having given complete and copious narratives of these popular chapters of the national mythology; partly to his being the first prose author of the classical period who had treated either of them in a separate or integral form.

The anxiety of Herodorus to enliven the illustrative element of his text displays itself chiefly in his subtle attempts at mythological interpretation, and in his speculations on physical and geographical subjects. These speculations, while savouring of the sophistical school of his age, are marked at times by a fantastic eccentricity which commended them to the notice of abler naturalists than Herodorus himself. Aristotle[3], among others, quotes and comments on his theories with a gravity which shows that, if he did not acquiesce in them, he considered them worthy of respect. "The vulture," says that philosopher, "builds

[1] Frgg. 55—58. [2] Frgg. 43. 59. [3] Frgg. 10. 12.

her nest on lofty and inaccessible rocks: hence it is that a young vulture is rarely seen. It has even been asserted that no one ever saw a young bird of the vulture species. This led Herodorus, father of Bryson the sophist, to maintain that the vulture was an animal bred and habitually residing in some distant aerial world; whence also he explained the suddenness with which they appear in the upper air, often in great numbers." This and other peculiarities for which the same bird was said to be distinguished, were illustrated in other texts of Herodorus, cited by different authors, and were described by him as the source of the special purity and sanctity attributed to it by Hercules, above the rest of the feathered tribe, not even excepting the eagle.[1] Various other commentaries of Herodorus on the nature and habits of different animals are noticed by the Stagirite philosopher.[2]

The excursions of Herodorus in the region of mythological interpretation, while less poetical, are not more remarkable for common sense than his flight to the visionary abode of the vultures. The fabled structure of the walls of Troy by Neptune and Apollo as hired architects of Laomedon, with the impiety of their employer in refusing their stipulated wages, was explained[3] as a figurative mode of showing forth how the impious king had plundered the temples of the two gods of their treasures, and withheld from them their just meed of sacrifice, in order to devote the funds accruing from this outrage on their dignity to the better fortification of his city. The story of Hercules undertaking for a season the

[1] Frg. 10. [2] De Generat. Anim. III. 6. [3] Frg. 18.

burthen imposed upon Atlas of bearing the heavens on his shoulders, signified a course of lessons in astronomy, for which the Theban adventurer was indebted to the African giant.[1] Prometheus[2] was a Scythian king; the eagle which preyed on his vitals was a river called the Eagle, which laid waste his country with its inundations. Hercules delivered him from its ravages, by straightening and embanking the course of the stream. These specimens will suffice to show that this recondite branch of archæological research had made but small beneficial progress since the time when Hecatæus, in a like dull spirit of pragmatical subtlety, had, as mentioned in another place, proposed similar interpretations of other exploits of the same hero.

His Œdipus and Pelopia.

These two principal compositions of Herodorus appear to have survived to a late period, being quoted freely by authors of every subsequent age of classical antiquity. Two other works are mentioned as having been composed by him; one under the title of Œdipus, the other under that of Pelopia. A single citation alone of each is extant.[3]

It was to be expected that Herodorus, though a native of an Æolo-Dorian colony, would write in the Ionic dialect, as that commonly employed by authors in his own branch of composition. Traces of Ionism

[1] Frg. 24. [2] Frg. 23.: conf. 61.

[3] Frgg. 5, 6. 61. The passage of the Pelopia (frg. 61.) alludes to the rescue of the infant Orestes from Ægisthus; that from the Œdipus (frgg. 5, 6.) defines the stature of Hercules. It has been conjectured with some plausibility (Müller ad frg. 5.) that these titles may denote separate books of the Life of Hercules; the one descriptive of portions of his personal or family history connected with Peloponnesus; the other of portions connected with Bœotia. It is not, however, easy to see how the adventures of Orestes could be treated with propriety, even episodically, in connexion with those of Hercules.

accordingly are observable in the few lines of literal extract from his text that have been preserved[1], but which supply no adequate criteria for estimating the general character of his style.

### HELLANICUS OF MITYLENE.

Hellanicus of Mitylene.

His age.

17. The most authentic notice of the age of this author[2] is the general statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus[3], indirectly confirmed by Thucydides[4], that he flourished during the latter half of the fifth century B.C., and that he outlived the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, in 431 B.C. A fragment of one of his works also implies that he survived the termination of that war, in 404 B.C.[5]: allusion being there made to transactions subsequent to the battle of Arginusæ fought in the previous year, 406; and, if he was still engaged in writing after the latter date, his life may probably have extended to the close of the century. No great weight attaches to the authority of Lucian[6], who states him to have reached the age of 85. Admitting however that notice to be correct, and that he died about the year 400 B.C., his birth would have taken place about 485 B.C., within a year of the date usually assigned to the birth of Herodotus; so that the two historians would, on this basis, have been strictly contemporaneous.[7] That

[1] Frgg. 20. 60.

[2] His remains, ap. Didot, vol. I.; and Sturz, Fragg. Hellanici, 1826.

[3] De Thucyd. Jud. 5.

[4] I. 97.

[5] Frg. 80. (Didot); to which may be added his notice, in frg. 78., of the orator Andocides, who could hardly have been a person of such notoriety as to call forth so marked an allusion, until towards the close of the century.

[6] De Macrobb. 22.

[7] Far too much weight has been attached by the modern biographers

Herodotus, in the popular adjustment of epochs, for authentic adjustment we have none, should rank as the younger of the two, would be the natural result of the more advanced stage of their common art which his work represents. By Suidas [1] we are told that the name of the Lesbian historian's father was "said by some to be Aristomenes, by others Andromenes, by others Scammon;" a piece of information hardly worth the elaborate commentaries bestowed on it by modern critics.[2] He is said by the same Suidas to have had a son called Scammon; to have resided at the court of Amyntas king of Macedon; and to have died at Perperene, a small town on the Æolian coast opposite his native isle of Lesbos.

Catalogue of his works.

Hellanicus is distinguished among the historians of the flourishing age of Greece by the number of works which he composed; or which at least authors of various epochs cite by more or less distinct titles as passing current under his name. The sum total of these titles amounts to about thirty; which number however requires to be greatly reduced, in order to

of both Hellanicus and Herodotus to the authority of Pamphila (ap. Gell. xv. 23.), who makes Hellanicus sixty-five, and Herodotus fifty-three years old at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, in 431 B.C. This notice seems to be virtually falsified in the case of Hellanicus by his own evidence. For, if he was 65 in 431 B. C., he would have been past 90 at the time when he wrote the passage above quoted. So prolonged a life of literary activity, though not impossible, is not certainly probable; nor, had he really, like Isocrates, lived and written beyond ninety, is it likely that Lucian, whose object was to magnify his longevity, would have restricted it to eighty-five years. Mr. Grote differs from all previous authorities, in making Hellanicus decidedly junior to Herodotus. This eccentric, but not in itself unreasonable opinion, he supports by no arguments; and it is not very easy to reconcile with the implicit reliance which elsewhere, in treating of the age of Herodotus, he appears to place in the authority of Pamphila. Hist. of Gr. vol. VI. p. 617.: conf. IV. p. 305. note.

[1] v. Ἑλλάνικος

[2] C. Müller, ap. Didot, p. xxiv.

furnish any accurate estimate of his literary labours. Some of the works enumerated were certainly spurious; or perhaps never existed but in the imagination of trifling grammarians. In several instances different titles are used to denote the same book. Others seem to have originated in the practice of quoting under separate denominations the principal subdivisions of works of great compass or variety of subject.[1] But even with due allowance for such reductions, there would remain some ten or twelve integral compositions of considerable bulk. The entire list is subjoined. The principal works have there been ranked in the chronological order of their subjects; in so far as it admits of being established. The details of the scheme of arrangement will be explained in the sequel.

Deucalionia. Thessalica.
Phoronis (Argolica, Bœotica).
Atlantis.
Arcadica.
Atthis. Historia Attica: Historia (Asopis).
Troïca.
Æolica (Lesbica).
Sacerdotes Junonis Argivæ.
Carneonicæ.
Persica.

---

Ægyptiaca.
Iter ad Ammonem.

[1] The title Cranaïca, in the Schol. of Aristoph. (frg. 85.), is evidently a corruption of Carneonicæ. That of Τὰ περὶ Λυδίαν (frgg. 124. sq.), referring simply to certain remarks on, or notices of, Lydia, by Hellanicus, has no claim to a place in the list, either as a separate work, or a separate book or chapter of a work.

De Gentibus. De Gentium nominibus.
Instituta Barbarica.
Foundations (Foundation of Chios).
Cypriaca.
Scythica.
Phœnicica.
Jovis Polytychia.

Hellanicus was certainly, upon the whole, the most accomplished of the historical writers who flourished prior to Herodotus; forming the last link in the chain which connects the latter with Acusilaus or Cadmus of Miletus. His historical method betrays, it is true, the essential characteristics of the old logographic school; but those characteristics are developed under greater variety of forms, and in a more extended range of literary enterprise. A large portion of his genealogical labours is bestowed on as visionary pedigrees as those which figure in the four books of Acusilaus. A similar share of his geographical research is occupied with etymological trivialities rivaling any propounded by Hecatæus. But his notices even of mythical events, such as the early migrations of the Pelasgic races in Hellas and the neighbouring regions, are often fraught with a spirit of enlarged, almost critical investigation, of which there is little trace in the page of his predecessors. His researches in the regions of more authentic history, if not remarkable for depth or precision, appear to have been honest and impartial, and extend over a wider field than those of any author prior to Herodotus. Of occasional errors or oversights there are no doubt traces in his remains. But the sweeping charges of credulity, falsehood, and ignorance, brought against

him by Ephorus[1] and Strabo[2], are not borne out by any evidence adduced in their support. He has also, as we have already seen, the merit of having attempted, with partial success, to impart chronological order and method to his historical text, a merit to which Herodotus has no pretension whatever.

The prominent fault of this author appears to have been his want of method in the distribution of his materials; which, instead of being embodied, like those of his otherwise inferior predecessors, Pherecydes and Hecatæus, into one or more comprehensive works, were subdivided among a number of desultory treatises. His few attempts at a more enlarged range of historical combination appear to have resulted but in meagre summaries, or chronological compendia of matters in great part already treated by himself in other separate tracts. Of epic unity or condensation he seems to have had no clear conception. His numerous compositions accordingly, embracing, in one form or other, the whole or the greater part of the subjects treated by Herodotus in his single work, bear to that work much the same relation as the ballads of the ante-Homeric age bore to the Iliad and Odyssey. For this defect he is pointedly stigmatised by antient critics.[3]

It is however certain, as already remarked, that the number of titles in the list above given exceeds that of the works actually composed by Hellanicus. The catalogue, in order to simplify our analysis of its contents, has been divided into two parts. The first

[1] Frg. 91. Didot.

[2] x. p. 451., xi. p. 508., xii. p. 550.

[3] Agathem. i. 1. Ἑλλάνικος γὰρ ὁ Λέσβιος, ἀνὴρ πολυπίστων, ἁπλάστως παρέδωκε τὴν ἱστορίαν: conf. Dion. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 6.

contains the ascertained genuine works of the historian; the second those the existence or genuine character of which is questionable. In the first, the principal title of each work has been given in capital letters. The titles subjoined in ordinary type, where not in parenthesis, are the duplicate or subordinate titles of the same work. Those in parenthesis belong to its separate heads or chapters. The same method has been partially followed in regard to the second part of the list. Few however of the titles which it contains have been attested on such valid authority or in so distinct a manner, as to warrant their being assumed to represent integral works either genuine or supposititious.

DEUCALIONIA. Thessalica.

His Deucalionia.

18. It seems doubtful whether Hellanicus conceded to the tradition of the repeopling the earth by Deucalion, after the flood, the same priority over other parallel legends awarded to it by Hesiod, and in the popular mythology; or whether he may not rather have given a preference to the claims of Phoroneus, the patriarchal hero of southern Greece, who in the Argolic tradition also figures as father of the human species, and whose affairs supplied Hellanicus with materials for another of his principal works. It seems indeed doubtful whether Hellanicus considered the flood of Deucalion as universal; and not rather as limited to the regions of northern Greece; and as a calamity consequently from the effects of which the Peloponnesian races remained exempt. In the absence however of more positive data on the subject, it has been assumed that he acquiesced in the popular

view, and a precedence has accordingly been assigned to the Deucalionia in the chronological series of his researches.

The two principal fragments describe the birth of Deucalion, and his rescue, with his wife Pyrrha, from the deluge, in their ark. The remainder are chiefly of a geographical tendency, describing the recolonisation of Thessaly and the surrounding region by the new race of men. The notices of this recolonisation are limited to the countries north of the Corinthian isthmus; a limitation which seems to confirm the conjecture that, in the tradition of Hellanicus, the southern peninsula was peopled by a race distinct from that called into existence by Deucalion.

There can be little doubt that the whole Thessalian chapter of mythical genealogy was treated by Hellanicus, as by other popular logographers, in conjunction with the history of Deucalion, king of Thessaly, and patriarch of the Hellenic race of northern Greece.[1] We have not hesitated therefore to class the title Thessalica as a duplicate of that of Deucalionia. The connexion between Deucalion and Thessaly seems indeed to have been peculiarly close in the system of Hellanicus, who describes the ark of this Hellenic Noah as resting after the flood on the Thessalian mount Orthrys[2], not on Parnassus as in the popular version of the legend. From the tenor of several of the fragments, it also appears that Hellanicus, like other popular fabulists, gave a prominent place in the book of Thessalian tradition to the Argonautic enterprise.

This work was divided, probably by the gramma-

[1] Frg. 15.

[2] Frg. 16.

rians of later times, into books; a first and second of which are mentioned in the citations.

### Phoronis (Argolica, Bœotica).

Phoronis. As the antient hero Phoroneus, from whom the principal title of this work is derived, styled "father of mortal men" in the old epic genealogy[1], represents the primitive Pelasgic race of the Argolis before the arrival of Danaus and his followers, the probability at once suggests itself that the title Argolica, or Argive history, belonged to the same work. That such was the case is further evinced by the fact, that several passages quoted by antient authors as from the Argolica relate to events in the life of Phoroneus.[2] No less certain is it that the title Bœotica was but a third variety of designation for the same book, little as may be on first view the apparent connexion between the regions of Bœotia and Argolis; for several detailed notices of strictly Bœotian adventures, those for example of the Theban patriarch Cadmus, are cited by some authorities from the Bœotica, by others from the Phoronis.[3]

However little alive Hellanicus may have been to the value of epic unity in historical narrative, he would yet hardly have brought these two regions, in his genealogical system, into a connexion altogether unauthorised by any bond of union in their own traditions. But such a bond is not difficult to recognise. As father of Pelasgus, Phoroneus also claimed to be father of the entire primitive population of Greece[4], of the Bœotian aborigines consequently, as well as of those of Peloponnesus. He was however essentially a

[1] See Vol. II. p. 478.
[2] Frg. 37.
[3] Frg. 2.
[4] See Vol. II. sup. cit.

physical or cosmogonical, rather than a human hero. Son of the local river Inachus, and of the ocean nymph Archia[1], he neither performs any human exploit, nor forms any human alliance. The etymology both of his own name and of his mother's seems to stamp him as a pure abstraction, representing rather productive power than social existence. The father of the heroic dynasty of Argos was Danaus. But Danaus of Argos and Cadmus of Bœotia are in the legend brothers or cousins, scions of the Syro-Egyptian stock of Belidæ. The relation between the heroes seems to have suggested to Hellanicus a parallel union in his system between the destinies of the regions which they occupied. This union was maintained in the legend of Hercules, whose lineage and birth connect him equally with Argos and Thebes. It was further extended in the common chapter supplied by the Theban wars of succession to the book both of Argolic and of Bœotian tradition; in the refuge afforded by Adrastus king of Argos to Polynices; in the marriage of the refugee prince to the daughter of that king; and in the series of fatal adventures which resulted from the alliance. Another bond of connexion might naturally occur to the Æolian Hellanicus in the circumstance, that while Bœotia was the recognised mother state of his native Æolian colonies, those settlements were founded under the leadership of Argive princes; of Orestes, son of Agamemnon, according to Hellanicus himself[2]; of Penthilus, son of Orestes, in other versions of the legend.

The fragments of this work, about fifteen in number, commemorate the vicissitudes of the primitive

[1] Hygin. 143.

[2] Frg. 114.

Pelasgian descendants of Phoroneus, and of the subsequent dynasty of Belidæ; the adventures of Cadmus and of Hercules; the crimes and misfortunes of Œdipus and his descendants. Hellanicus also appears to have traced in the Phoronis the destinies of the Pelasgian race in other distant regions. The important passage[1] recording the migration of Tyrrheno-Pelasgians flying before Hellenic conquerors from Thessaly to Italy, their foundation of the cities of Spina on the Po and of Cortona in Etruria, and their subsequent conquest of central Italy, a passage so often cited and commented by leading Italian antiquaries from the days of Dionysius of Halicarnassus down to those of Niebuhr, was contained in the Phoronis. It confirms the view above stated, that in the system of Hellanicus the aboriginal seat of the Pelasgians was the Argolis, whence they migrated to northern Greece and Italy. A like inference may be drawn from another fragment[2], where the Thessalian Larissa is described as founded by the Argive king Acrisius, and named after Larissa daughter of Pelasgus; as a colony consequently of the Argolic metropolis, the ancient name of which, peculiar in later times to its citadel, was also Larissa.

The tradition followed by Hellanicus[3] relative to the origin of the Theban war placed Polynices distinctly in the wrong. It represented him as having voluntarily relinquished to his brother his claim to the half-share of the throne, in consideration of his receiving the largest allotment of the family treasure; in breach of which engagement he renewed, and asserted by arms, his pretensions to a participation in the royal

[1] Frg. 1. [2] Frg. 29. [3] Frg. 12.

dignity. There is no trace in the fragments, of any portion of the Phoronis having been devoted to the events of real history. It was divided into books, two of which are noticed in the citations.[1]

## Atlantis.

The subject indicated by this title might be made to comprehend a wide field of mythical genealogy, the patriarchs of many Hellenic tribes being fabled the offspring of one or other of the daughters of Atlas. These nymphs were transformed, part into the constellation of the Pleiads, part into that of the Hyads. One of the fragments[2] enumerates the six who composed the latter constellation. Of these Taÿgete is described as mother of Lacedæmon by Jupiter; Electra as mother of Dardanus and Cres by the same god; Halcyone as bearing the Bœotian patriarch Hyrieus to Neptune; Sterope as bearing Œnomaus of Elis to Mars; and Merope as mother of Glaucus by Sisyphus of Corinth. It is, however, not probable that the mythology of the districts represented by these personages was treated at any length in this work; the Atlantid patriarchs being, for the most part, like Phoroneus, of the figurative rather than the heroic order, and superseded by the dynasties of more active rulers and founders, who rank as foreign adventurers under the titles of Belidæ and Pelopidæ. The fragments, with the exception of that above cited, throw little light on the subject. Allusion occurs in Atlantis.

[1] The notice by Harpocration of a tenth book of this work (frg. 4.), may originate in a corruption of δευτέρῳ into δεκάτῳ. There is no hint elsewhere of any work of Hellanicus having been divided into ten books, or even into half that number.

[2] Frg. 56.

one to the Homeridæ of Chios. The work was divided into books, of which the first alone is named in the citations.

Arcadica. ARCADICA. This title, unnecessarily classed by some commentators as a variety of Atlantis, sufficiently bespeaks the subject of the work to which it belonged. Of the four extant citations referable to its text, two are of a geographical tendency; others mention the combat of Hercules with the Stymphalian birds, which Hellanicus, like Pisander, described as having been frightened away by the hero with gongs or rattles, rather than slain by warlike weapons.[1]

ATTHIS. Historia Attica: Historiæ (Asopis).

Atthis. 19. The most important, and probably the longest work of Hellanicus, was his Atthis, called by Thucydides[2] Attic history, and honoured by other authorities with the comprehensive title of Histories.[3] It treated the annals, both mythical and real, of Attica, in partial connexion with those of other Greek states, from the remotest age down to the close of the Peloponnesian war. The narrative commenced[4] with the reign of Ogyges, dated by Hellanicus 1796 years B. C., and seems, like the Milesian tradition, to have brought the migration to Attica of Cecrops and his fellow Egyptian colonists into connexion with Moses

[1] Frg. 61. [2] I. 97.

[3] That this title, Ἱστορίαι, on the only two occasions of its occurrence in the fragments (3. 96.), denotes a particular work, rather than, as might otherwise appear natural, the historical researches of the author in the wider sense, is plain from frg. 3., where it is opposed to the title Phoronis. In the more specific sense the work to which it was most properly applicable was the Atthis, as being the most strictly historical composition of Hellanicus.

[4] Frg. 62.

and the Jewish Exodus.[1] It described the origin of the Panathenaic festival[2], and of the court of Areopagus, with the more celebrated causes in which its jurisdiction had been exercised[3]; the adventure of Theseus with the Minotaur[4], his wars against the Amazons[5], his rape of Helen; the rescue of the princess by the Dioscuri; the capture by them of Æthra mother of Theseus[6], and the slavery of that heroine as handmaid of Helen until restored to liberty by her grandsons in the sack of Troy.[7] The lineage of Codrus, the last king of Athens, was traced back through Nestor to Deucalion[8]; that of Miltiades[9] through Æacus to Jupiter; that of the orator Andocides[10] to Ulysses. The occupation of Peloponnesus by the Dorians was narrated, with the reduction of the Helots to slavery[11], and the migration of the sons of Codrus to Ionia.[12] The first establishment of the Lacedæmonian constitution was attributed[13], not to Lycurgus but to his ancestors Procles and Eurysthenes, the first Dorian kings of Sparta; a statement adduced by Ephorus as proof of the author's ignorance, but which the modern critic will be rather inclined to consider as indicating rational scepticism founded on independent research. Notice also occurred of the institution of the Hellenodicæ, or judges of the Olympic games.[14] In the only fragment relative to the Persian war, the Naxians are stated to have contributed six galleys to the Greek naval force

[1] Frg. 156. wrongly numbered by Müller among the fragments of the Ægyptiaca.
[2] Frg. 65. [3] Frgg. 69. 82. [4] Frg. 73.
[5] Frgg. 76. 84. [6] Frg. 74. [7] Frg. 75.
[8] Frg. 10. very strangely numbered by Müller among the remains of the Bœotica.
[9] Frg. 14. [10] Frg. 78. [11] Frg. 67.
[12] Frg. 63. [13] Frg. 91. [14] Frg. 90.

at Salamis.[1] Hellanicus was here at issue with Herodotus[2], who describes those islanders as sending four ships to the fleet of Xerxes, all of which, however, deserted to the Greeks. Hellanicus is quoted by Thucydides as having also treated in this work, but in a superficial manner, the general history of Greece between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars; and we have seen that, in a passage formerly referred to[3], he alluded to events connected with the close of the latter contest. Four books of the Atthis are mentioned in the citations.

Asopis.

The single fragment of the Asopis[4], in which the pedigree of Miltiades is traced back to Æacus, implies that composition to have been a book or chapter of the Atthis. It was the part probably which treated more especially of the line of Æacidæ who reigned in Salamis and Ægina; Ægina being fabled daughter of Asopus and mother of Æacus, and the Æacidæ being claimed by the Athenians of later times as original vassals of their state.

Æolica: Lesbica.

ÆOLICA (Lesbica). These titles may safely be classed as representing a single work on the history of the Æolian colonies; the latter of the two bearing special reference to the part of it devoted to the author's native island. In the principal extant fragment[5] the foundation of the colonies is ascribed to Orestes. The remaining citations are chiefly geographical notices of little interest.

## TROÏCA.

Troïca.

Of the Troïca or Trojan history, two books are cited in the fragments. In the general treatment

[1] Frg. 81. [2] VIII. 46. [3] Frg. 80. [4] Frg. 14. [5] Frg. 114.

of this subject Hellanicus seems to have followed Homer; and several of the more detailed passages that have been preserved are little more than paraphrases of parallel portions of the Iliad. He described the origin of the Dardanian race[1]; the abduction of Ganymede, and the gifts bestowed by Jupiter on Tros in compensation for the loss of his son[2]; the structure of the walls of Troy by Apollo and Neptune; the impiety of Laomedon towards those deities, and the punishment inflicted on him[3]; the treacherous conduct of the same prince towards Hercules, and the sack of his city by that hero and Telamon[4]; the amour of Tithonus and Aurora[5]; the birth of Memnon, and the genealogy, crimes, and exploits of the race of Priam.[6] That he narrated the leading events of the Iliad with almost Homeric precision, may be gathered from a fragment descriptive of the combat between Achilles and the river Scamander; which adventure he explained by reference to physical phenomena.[7] The longest extant citation describes the escape of Æneas on the night of the capture of Troy; the exact year, month, and day of which event were specified.[8] The passage, though not a literal extract, seems to have been preserved in substance by Dionysius, and narrates with singular fulness of pragmatical detail the circumstances of the Dardanian hero's retreat from the burning city, as present to the imagination of the Lesbian historian. It describes the patriotic concern of Æneas for the preservation of his fellow-citizens, after all hope of saving the citadel was gone; and dwells on the ability

[1] Frgg. 129, 130. [2] Frg. 136. [3] Loc. cit.
[4] Frg. 138. [5] Frg. 142. [6] Frg. 140.
[7] Frg. 132. [8] Frg. 127.: conf. 143, 144.

of the stratagem by which their escape was provided for, the city gate secured, and the enemy kept at bay, while the fugitives collected without the walls. It relates the hero's subsequent series of military operations in the fastnesses of mount Ida; how he remustered the scattered Trojan forces in such numbers, and established them in so formidable a position, as to secure advantageous terms from the victors. The narrative in this passage closes with the surrender of his stronghold on honourable terms, his retirement from his native country with his followers, and his temporary settlement in Thrace. Thence, as we learn from another fragment of this work, and more fully from a passage[1] of the author's "Argive priestesses," he sailed to Italy and founded Rome. That Hellanicus also countenanced the Virgilian legend of the settlement of Trojan colonies in Sicily, appears from his mention, among the companions of the hero's flight, of an Elymus and an Ægestus, eponymes evidently of the Sicilian cities of Elyma and Segeste.[2] The only symptom of his having extended his notices of Trojan affairs beyond the limits of the fabulous age, is a fragment in which he appears to have vindicated the claims of the Ilium of his own time to be the genuine descendant of the city of Priam.[3]

Among the variations from the more familiar Homeric legend in this work, may be noticed[4] the oracle by which he describes the Trojans as having been warned to abstain from maritime adventure, and devote themselves solely to agricultural pursuits;

[1] Frg. 53.
[2] Frg. 127.: conf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. i. 52.
[3] Frg. 145.
[4] Frg. 139.

and that their neglect of this injunction would involve the ruin of their state. Æneas was also represented as rescuing his father and household gods from the flames on a waggon, not on his shoulders as in the more popular Stesichorean legend. Ascanius, the eldest son of the hero, is with Hellanicus neither the founder of Alba longa, nor the ancestor of the Julian race; but while his younger brother accompanies Æneas to Europe, he remains behind, and founds the city of Ascania in the interior of Asia minor.[1]

## Persica.

Persica. This work, two books of which are mentioned, treated both the fabulous and the historical annals of the Persian empire, touching, in the form of introduction it may be presumed, on the early history of Assyria. Prominence was given to the adventure of Perseus and Andromeda, as the earliest connecting link between Greek and oriental mythology. It does not appear whether Hellanicus, like Herodotus, made Perseus the patriarch of the Persian race; but he describes that hero as founder of various cities in the Persian territory. In his early Persian annals he seems to have differed materially from Herodotus. He mentions a warlike queen and conqueress called Atossa, of whom Herodotus knows nothing. That his narrative comprised the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, may be gathered from his notice in two of the fragments[2], of the Thracian towns of Tyrodiza and Strepsa, the former of which, as we learn from Herodotus[3], was a station of the Persian army on its march from the Hellespont.

[1] Frg. 127. [2] Frgg. 161, 162. [3] VII. 23.

## The Priestesses of Juno Argiva

Argive Priestesses.

was a chronological compilation, arranged according to the succession of those venerable functionaries, and comprising notices of the more remarkable events that occurred during the ministry of each. How far the line of sacerdotal succession was followed out by Hellanicus we are not informed; but as its dates were standard epochs at the time of the Peloponnesian war, being quoted as such by Thucydides, it may be presumed that the catalogue extended down to historical times. The extant quotations, however, refer exclusively to the mythical age. The most valuable is that descriptive of the foundation of Rome. The tradition here followed by Hellanicus, while it differs from that of Antiochus the contemporary Sicilian historian, possesses a peculiar interest, as well from its coincidence in substance with that of Virgil, as from the discrepancy in the details of the two. We have seen elsewhere[1] that Stesichorus had represented Æneas, after the fall of Troy, as sailing for Hesperia, or the Land of the west. Hellanicus, like Virgil, describes him as retiring first to the coast of Thrace. In the course of his subsequent wanderings he meets Ulysses on an amicable footing in Molossia; whence the two heroes continue their westward voyage in company. On the coast of Latium the female followers of Æneas, wearied of their vagabond life, destroyed his fleet with fire. The instigator of this desperate act was a matron named Roma, after whom was called the city, founded on a convenient site in the region which she had been the means of securing for her fellow-wanderers as their final resting-

[1] Vol. III. p. 240.

place.[1] An account was also given of the migrations of the various Italian tribes across the straits of Messina, and of their colonisation of the isle of Sicily.[2]

Three books of this work are mentioned in the citations, the general tenor of which implies its contents to have been chiefly geographical; notices, that is, of the foundation of cities or colonies, at the various sacerdotal epochs which formed the connecting links of the narrative.

Carneonicæ.

The Carneonicæ[3], while resembling the work just described in its plan and arrangement, possesses interest as one of the first essays in literary history of which mention occurs in Grecian literature. It was a Chronicle of the victors in the Carnean games, the chief musical festival of Sparta, founded in 676 B.C. under the direction of the Lesbian musician Terpander. The solemnities of this festival continued to be regulated by a succession of distinguished musicians of the same school and country. Hence, probably, the peculiar interest taken in the subject by the Lesbian historian. Of the only three extant fragments[4], one relates to the epoch of the institution and of its author; the other to a no less celebrated Lesbian musician Arion, inventor of the Cyclic chorus or Dithyramb, and whose sphere of activity may probably have extended, like that of Terpander, to the Spartan Carnea.

[1] Frg. 53. [2] Frg. 53.: conf. 51.

[3] Athenæus, in his citation of the Carneonicæ (frg. 122.), appears to distinguish two works of Hellanicus bearing that name; the one in verse, the other in prose. Suidas also mentions poetical works of Hellanicus. But neither passage is sufficiently precise or authentic to warrant our assuming, amid the general silence of antiquity, that Hellanicus was a poet as well as a historian.

[4] Frgg. 122, 123. 85. There can be no doubt that κραναϊκοῖς in the last-quoted citation, ranged by C. Müller as a separate title, is a mere corruption of κ[arneonicais].

Apocryphal works.

20. Ægyptiaca. The genuine character of this work has been questioned by modern commentators[1], chiefly on account of certain subtleties of moral dogma inculcated in one of the fragments, and little compatible either in substance or style with the genius of Hellanicus. The text appears, like that of most other early treatises on the same subject, to have mainly consisted of mythical anecdotes and descriptions of the marvels, real or imaginary, in which Egypt abounded or was fabled to abound. The only fragment of a strictly historical nature[2] gives an account of the usurpation of the Egyptian throne by Amasis, somewhat different from the narrative of the same event by Herodotus.

The title, Journey to the temple of Ammon, might seem to designate a section of the Ægyptiaca; but in the sole existing allusion to the work, by Athenæus, who questions its genuine character, it appears to be mentioned as a separate composition.

"On the Nations;" "On the Names of Nations." These two kindred titles form each the subject of a single citation, the vagueness of which, with the apocryphal tenor of the notices they supply, renders it doubtful whether the works referred to can be considered as independent compositions; or, if so, whether they can safely be ranked as genuine works of Hellanicus. The imposing fabric consequently which, on the feeble basis of the second of those titles, a modern commentator has constructed out of some eighteen or twenty notices[3] of names of nations culled from the miscellaneous fragments of Hellanicus, may be dismissed as illusive, and its materials allowed

[1] C. Müller, de Hellan. p. xxx.
[2] Frg. 151.
[3] Frgg. 93. sqq.

to rank simply as unidentified passages of his other better-accredited works. The passages themselves afford however a fair sample of the method pursued by him in this branch of research; a method which does not exhibit any great advance in the art of ethnographical criticism beyond the standard of Hecatæus or Acusilaus. With him, as with them, the name of a founder is always readily provided from that of the place founded. Thus Sikelia (Sicily) is derived from Sikelus; Macedonia from Macedon; Parnassus mountain from Parnassus hero; and so forth. One however of these etymological quibbles, the derivation of the name Italia from the Latin word Vitulus, a calf[1], possesses an intrinsic value, as establishing the fact that Hellanicus was acquainted, however slightly, with the Latin language; the first symptom of any such knowledge on the part of a Greek author. We have seen that he was also familiar with the names of several cities of northern and central Italy, — Spina, Cortona, and Rome, — little if at all explored or visited in his time; and that he knew the legend of the settlement of Æneas in Latium, much in the form in which it existed in the flourishing age of Roman literature. These notices, with those relative to the migrations of the Pelasgo-Tyrrhenians across the Adriatic, to their adventures in their new seats, to the cities founded by them there, and to the consequent movements of the ejected Italo-Siculian tribes through central and southern Italy and on the opposite shores of Sicily, — all display a knowledge of those regions, and a spirit of research into their history, far surpassing any exhibited by Herodotus, or

His knowledge of the Latin tongue.

[1] Frg. 97.

even by the standard historians of the subsequent generation.

The remaining titles in the list may be briefly disposed of. The Instituta Barbarica, once mentioned by Suidas, may possibly have been an integral composition; not, probably, a genuine one.[1] The title Foundations, with that of Foundation of Chios, may indicate chapters of the Chronicle of Priestesses, or of other ascertained works devoted more immediately to geographical research. The rare and vague citations of Scythica, Cypriaca, and Phœnicica, also probably refer to integral portions of other works, in which the author may have touched on the history or geography of Scythia, Cyprus, or Phœnicia. The title of Dios Polytychia, or Fortunes of Jupiter, once noticed by Suidas, may be allowed to remain in the same state of mystery in which that learned compiler has left it, and in which probably the subject of the work referred to was equally involved.

Style.

Although we possess several long paraphrases of passages of this author, the literal extracts from his text are rare and scanty. The imperfect evidence which they afford would indicate his style to have been, like that of his contemporary Pherecydes, a medium between the sententiousness of the primitive logographer, and the studied periods of the Siculo-Attic rhetorician. It is described by the antient commentators as in no respect distinguished by popular attributes.[2] Of the Ionic dialect in which he

[1] It is described by Porphyry (ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev. x. p. 466.), as a cento of passages pirated from Herodotus (?) and Damasus (Damastes?). See Müller ad Fragg. Hellan. p. xxix.

[2] Auctt. ap. Müller in Fragg. p. xxxiii.

composed, little trace is observable in his remains. This may be owing partly to the changes which his text may have undergone on its passage to posterity; partly perhaps to an approximation of his own idiom to that of Attica, which during the greater part of his literary career was rapidly acquiring, in every branch of composition, a marked ascendancy over the other dialects.

## DAMASTES

Damastes of Sigeum.

of Sigeum in the Troad, son of Dioxippus, is described by Dionysius as contemporaneous with Hellanicus and Herodotus[1]; and as author of many works, four of which are specified under the following titles: 1. A genealogy of the heroes who fought at Troy.[2] 2. A catalogue of nations and cities. 3. A Periplus. 4. On the poets and sophists. He is called a pupil of Hellanicus, and accused of having pirated from Hecatæus.[3] The former notice seems to be confirmed by the agreement between the two authors in various important heads of historical information. By both the foundation of Rome was ascribed to Æneas[4]; both derived the name of the city from Roma[5], chief of the fugitive Trojan matrons who, by burning the hero's fleet off the coast of Latium, forced him to settle in that region; to which might be added other less momentous points of correspondence.

This writer seems to have been chiefly quoted as

[1] Dion. Hal. de Thucyd. 5.; Suidas, v. Δαμάστης.
[2] Some ascribed this work to Polus of Agrigentum; Suid. v. Πῶλος.
[3] Suid. v. Δαμάστης; Agathem. Epitom. geog. 1. 1.
[4] Frg. 8.: conf. Hellan. Frag. 53.
[5] Frgg. 1. 5, 6. 10.: conf. Hellan. Frag. 96.

an authority on geographical questions. Eratosthenes frequently referred to him; sometimes as a voucher for his own statements, sometimes for the purpose of refuting his opinions or censuring his errors. Eratosthenes has been severely blamed in his turn by Strabo[1], for having honoured with so much attention one whom Strabo characterises as so frivolous a writer. But the hasty severity with which Strabo is apt to dismiss authorities of better-attested value than Damastes, renders his condemnatory verdict of less weight in any such question than the more favourable judgement of Eratosthenes.

The work On the poets and sophists may rank with that of Glaucus of Rhegium on the Musicians, and with the Carneonicæ of Hellanicus, among the earliest essays in literary history. Damastes is quoted, probably from this treatise, as having, in common with Pherecydes and Hellanicus, traced the pedigree of Homer back to Orpheus and Musæus.

[1] I. p. 47., XIV. p. 684.

# CHAP. IV.

## HERODOTUS. HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

1. HERODOTUS THE HOMER OF PROSE HISTORY. — 2. HIS AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES. — 3. OTHER NOTICES OF HIS LIFE. HIS HALICARNASSIAN NATIVITY. HIS SETTLEMENT AT THURIUM, AND ITS IMPUTED CAUSES. EPOCH OF HIS BIRTH. — 4. TRADITION OF HIS RECITAL OF HIS WORK AT OLYMPIA. HISTORICAL OBJECTIONS TO THAT TRADITION. — 5. ITS INTRINSIC IMPROBABILITY. — 6. HIS WORK ROSE BUT SLOWLY IN POPULAR ESTIMATION. TEARS OF THUCYDIDES. OTHER SUPPOSED PUBLIC RECITALS AT CORINTH, THEBES, ATHENS. — 7. ASSYRIAN HISTORY OF HERODOTUS. HIS DEATH AND CHARACTER.

Herodotus the Homer of prose history.

1. It may possibly have occurred to the critical reader, in following the previous course of this narrative, that a reasonable claim might be advanced in favour of Herodotus, to rank as prior rather than posterior to several of the authors who have occupied our attention in the foregoing chapter. But whatever may be the speculative arguments in favour either of his or their title to precedence, it is at least certain, that the literary life of each of the rival candidates was comprised in whole or in greater part within the second half of the fifth century B. C., and that all consequently were more or less contemporaneous. It has therefore been thought desirable, setting aside any more special pretensions that might be advanced on one or other side, to assign to Herodotus the last, and, as reflecting his more advanced proficiency in the common art, the most honourable position in the series. This arrangement will tend, on the one hand to secure him that individual prominence which belongs to him as the most accom-

plished master of the primitive school of historical composition; on the other hand, it will connect him more directly with his great rival in fame Thucydides, who stands to him in the immediate relation of successor in regard to the subject, the style, and it may be presumed the publication, of his work.

Next to the Iliad and Odyssey, which two poems, as jointly representing the Homeric epopee, may here be considered as one, the history of Herodotus is the greatest effort of Greek literary genius. The analogy between the works is not more remarkable in their common features of grandeur, than in those of structure and character. The one is the perfection of epic poetry, the other the perfection of epic prose. Were it not for the influence which the prior existence of so noble a model, even in a different branch of composition, has evidently exercised on the historian, his title to the palm of original invention might rival even that of his poetical predecessor. It is usually, and perhaps reasonably, assumed, that the Iliad is the prototype of the Hellenic epopee, and that the poems which preceded it were comparatively brief and desultory ballads. There is however no actual proof that such was the case; while there are even symptoms in Homer's own allusions to earlier minstrels and their lays, of a certain advance having already been made towards that comprehensive unity of design which we admire in the Iliad and Odyssey. But it is very doubtful at the best, whether any similar approach had been made by the predecessors of Herodotus to a similar unity in his own order of narrative composition. If we follow out the analogy between the two authors from their relation towards their predecessors to that which they bear to their successors, the claim

of Herodotus to isolated individuality of character will be found not inferior to that of his poetical ancestor. Though no subsequent poet has surpassed, or even equalled Homer in excellence of epic combination, many have honourably competed with him. But Herodotus here stands alone among succeeding, as among prior historians. His work may be characterised, by a familiar and expressive foreign phrase to which our own tongue offers no equivalent, as "unique," in its merits and in its defects. In the complexity of its plan, as compared with the simplicity of its execution; in the multiplicity and heterogeneous nature of its materials, and in the harmony of their combination; in the grandeur of its historical masses and the minuteness, often triviality, of its illustrative details; it remains not only without equal, but without rival or parallel in the literature of Greece or of Europe.

It is not here proposed to offer, as has been attempted by popular modern authors who have laboured in the same field, a complete or connected life of Herodotus; and for the simple reason, that there exists no adequate stock of materials for such an undertaking. With the exception of the few data incidentally supplied by himself, the notices of his life rest on such recent or questionable authority, or are so plainly fabulous, that it is only by the aid of conjectural criticism that we can hope to elicit the slender ingredient of truth which they may contain. We might, indeed, following the example of more imaginative predecessors, amplify the legendary statements transmitted by Suidas, or Lucian, into as pleasant a form of biographical romance as we had ingenuity to impart to them. We prefer, however,

the less ambitious, but safer course of a historical inquiry. In following out this method, it will first be proper to have clearly before us the few facts that can be considered as more or less established on the historian's own testimony, or on that of the better class of secondary authorities; after which the more apocryphal or purely traditional notices will be examined.

His autobiographical notices.

2. Although Herodotus habitually writes in the first person, and dwells often, and in detail, on his own opinions, and on the mode and results of his researches in the countries which he visited, this egotism is confined, with a strictness so unvarying as to imply its being intentional, to matters connected with the immediate subject of his work. He has not vouchsafed a word of direct information as to the time or place of his birth, his parentage, habitual place of residence, or the vicissitudes of his life; nor are his indirect allusions to any of these points either copious or precise. In the opening sentence of his history he describes himself, according to the now received reading of the passage, as a Halicarnassian; but the accuracy of this reading, as will appear in the sequel, is open to question. That he flourished long after the events which he records, and which terminate with the defeat of Xerxes by land and sea in the year 479 B.C., is plain from his allusions, both to those events as belonging to a by-gone generation, and to others of long posterior date. That his own generation, however, was but a degree removed from that which fought at Salamis and Platæa, we learn from his statement[1] of his having been acquainted with one Thersander of Orchomenus, who had been present at

a banquet given by the Thebans to Mardonius the Persian general before the last-mentioned battle. This Thersander, he further informs us, repeated to him a conversation which had taken place on that occasion between him and a Persian officer who sat next to him at table, in which the latter expressed a melancholy presentiment of his own impending destruction, and that of the mighty armament in which he served.

That Herodotus survived to nearly the close of the fifth century B. C., may be inferred from passages of his work where he seems incidentally to mention transactions which took place as late as the year 408 B. C.[1] He must therefore still have been engaged in writing in that year, or rather in some still later year; for it is not likely that the transactions in question would be noticed by him in his work on the very year of their occurrence, and of its termination. It is therefore a fair further inference, that his life may have been prolonged some years beyond the date of the last events mentioned by him, and that he may consequently have seen the commencement of the fourth century B. C.

The remainder of the information supplied by Herodotus in the same indirect manner concerning himself, relates chiefly to his travels by land and sea; in the course of which he visited almost every part of Greece and its dependencies, and many of the other countries the affairs of which are treated in his work. The more remarkable places visited by him in

[1] I. 130., III. 15. See Appendix G. For the remainder of the passages of the history in which allusion is made to events that took place after the close of its own narrative, see Dahlmann, Herodot. ch. iii. § 8. pp. 38. sqq. To the list may be added IV. 81. 163., V. 77., VI. 131., VIII. 3.

Greece proper were: Athens, Thebes[1], Lacedæmon[2]; and the sanctuaries of Dodona[3], Delphi[4], and Tænarus.[5] He was probably a frequent sojourner at Athens. He describes himself[6] as having seen the Propylæa of the Acropolis, which were commenced about the year 436 B.C.[7]; and his participation in the Thurian colony of 444 would imply that his earlier visits to the city may have taken place eight or ten years sooner. To the westward his travels extended to the Cephallenian islands[8] and southern Italy; in which country he seems to have passed the greater part of the latter half of his life. The accuracy of his descriptions of other Hellenic localities, such as the battle fields of Marathon, Thermopylæ, and Platæa, can, even in the absence of more specific notices, leave little doubt of his having personally surveyed them. He shows a similar acquaintance with the parts of northern Greece, Macedonia, and Thrace, through which lay the Persian invaders' line of route; with the Thessalian plain and rivers[9], with the region of mount Athos[10], with the shores of the Thracian Chersonesus, and with the neighbouring islands.[11] He had sailed across the Black sea, but his knowledge of the countries on its more distant coasts seems to have been but limited; and he admits that he knew nothing, but from hearsay, of those immediately beyond the Danube.[12] He was however acquainted with the eastern shore of Scythia, between the rivers Hypanis and Borysthenes; and had penetrated into parts of the interior of that region, through the facilities it

[1] v. 59.
[2] III. 55.
[3] II. 55. sq.
[4] I. 51.
[5] I. 24.
[6] v. 77.
[7] Harpoc. v. Προπύλ.
[8] IV. 195.
[9] VIII. 129.
[10] I. 57., VII. 22.
[11] II. 44., VI. 46. sq.
[12] V. 9, 10

may be presumed which the Milesian colonies on its coast afforded to the Greek traveller.[1] He had also visited Colchis[2], on the isthmus between the Euxine and the Caspian seas; and had procured relative to the latter such information as to satisfy him that it was an insulated body of water, not a gulf of the Eastern ocean[3] as supposed by the less well informed of his countrymen in his own and in later times. With the coasts and islands of Asia minor on the Propontis[4], Hellespont, and Ægæan, he was intimately familiar. He had also penetrated into the interior of the Persian empire, as far as Babylon[5], Susa[6], and Ecbatana[7], possibly to parts of Bactria[8]; and his detailed description of the great imperial line of route from Sardis to Susa, warrants the belief that he had travelled along it.[9] He had visited Tyre, and other parts of Palestine or Phœnicia[10]; and had explored Egypt, from the shores of the Delta to the island of Elephantina.[11] Beyond that island he had not penetrated. One of his visits to this country, — for it is not improbable that its attractions and facilities of access may have tempted him to several,—took place shortly after the war between the Persian satrap Achæmenes, and the Libyan king Inarus, who, with a force consisting chiefly of Egyptian insurgents, maintained possession of part of lower Egypt against the Persian government from 462 to 456 B.C. For, in alluding to a difference of formation between the skull of the Persian and that of the Egyptian race, he appeals to specimens of each, examined by him-

[1] IV. 76. 81. 105.
[2] II. 104.
[3] I. 203.
[4] IV. 14.
[5] I. 181. sqq.
[6] VI. 119.
[7] I. 98.
[8] IV. 204.
[9] V. 52. sqq.
[10] II. 44. 106.
[11] II. 29.

self among the bones strewed on the battle field of Papremis, where Achæmenes had been defeated by Inarus, and himself slain with many of his troops.[1]

Herodotus does not seem to have possessed any knowledge, but from hearsay, of the interior of Arabia; with the exception, perhaps, of the route from Palestine to Egypt across the isthmus of Suez. In Libya he had visited the Greek colony of Cyrene.[2] But the details which he gives of the indigenous tribes of northern Africa, appear to have been derived from secondary sources. Nor is there any evidence of his having extended his travels to Carthage, to Spain, or to the parts of Italy northward of the Greek colonies on the lower extremity of that peninsula.

Other notices of his life.

3. Thus far Herodotus concerning himself. The earliest extant allusion to his personal history by any secondary authority is by Aristotle; who, in quoting the opening passage of his work, makes him designate himself, not Herodotus the Halicarnassian, as in the now current text, but Herodotus the Thurian[3]; and Plutarch, or whoever may be the author of the tract against Herodotus ascribed to Plutarch, insinuates[4] a doubt of his possessing any sufficient title to the honour, such as it was, of a Halicarnassian nativity. The unanimity, however, with which all his more impartial biographers[5] describe Halicarnassus as his birthplace, leaves no reasonable doubt of the fact. The other gentilic of Thurian substituted by Aristotle, whether a different reading of the text, or one of those mistakes not uncommon with that otherwise accurate author in his casual citation of books, is explained by the united statement of the same antient

[1] III. 12. [2] II. 181.: conf. 96. 32. [3] Rhetor. III. 9.
[4] c. 35. [5] Plut. de Exil. 13.; Strab. XIV. p. 657.

authorities who assign Halicarnassus as the historian's birthplace, that he took part in the colony of Thurium founded in Magna Græcia under Attic auspices in 444 B.C., and that he spent most of the latter part of his life in that city. The truth of this account is corroborated by several passages of his history, implying it to have been written in the south of Italy, a fact which is also stated by Pliny.[1] In a description, for example, of the Tauric Chersonesus, Herodotus compares that peninsula to the Sunian promontory of Attica; adding[2], that, "to those who may not have visited the latter country, the shape of the Iapygian peninsula south of Brundusium and Tarentum would supply an equally good illustration;" and various other points of internal evidence indicate a mind under Italiote impressions.[3]

His Halicarnassian nativity.

Halicarnassus, the birthplace of Herodotus, was a small Asiatic state, originally belonging to the Hexapolis, or confederacy of six Dorian colonies, on the coast of Caria and the neighbouring islands. The historian's native city never itself attained any high degree of political eminence, and such historical notoriety

[1] Hist. Nat. XII. 4.

[2] IV. 99.

[3] v. 44. sqq., VI. 21. 127., where, among the suitors for the daughter of Clisthenes, the two first mentioned are Italiotes. That his European associations, in so far as not engrossed by the Thurian colony, were closely connected with the mother state of Attica, appears both from IV. 99., and from another passage (II. 7.), where he compares the distance from the Egyptian town of Heliopolis to the sea, with that from Athens to the Temple of Jupiter at Olympia, of both which distances he professes to have obtained a measurement exact to a single stadium. To this argument of the strength of his local Attic impressions may be added that derivable, as more fully stated in another place (infra, Ch. VII.), from his tacit assumption of a familiarity on the part of his readers with the topography of the properly Attic battles of Marathon and Salamis; while his accounts of those of Thermopylæ and Platæa, the one fought in Locris the other in Bœotia, comprise more or less detailed geographical descriptions.

as it enjoyed was of no very creditable nature. It may, however, claim the honour of having produced three of the most remarkable men of whom, in their various branches of pursuit, the Greek republic of letters can boast: Herodotus, Panyasis, and Dionysius. The first was the most celebrated of Greek historians; the second, the accredited restorer of the art of epic poetry, and himself the most esteemed poet of the later renovated school; the third was one of the ablest Greek critics and antiquaries. Not long before the birth of Herodotus, Halicarnassus, as he himself informs us, had forfeited its privilege as a member of the Hexapolis, on account of a very discreditable breach of the common law of the confederacy, committed by one of her citizens and abetted by the remainder.[1] In the sequel she appears rather in the light of a Carian or Persian, than a Hellenic state, under the sway of a dynasty of petty tyrants tributary to the Persian emperor, and distinguished for their devotion to the service of their liege lord. The most celebrated of these local potentates was Artemisia, whose courage and zeal in the cause of her master Xerxes, during the disastrous vicissitudes of his Grecian expedition, are much commended by Herodotus.[2] It was hardly to be expected that the warm Hellenic patriotism which glowed in his own breast, should be very closely associated with the interests of his renegade Dorian birthplace. The fact of his having, like many other popular historians of the age, preferred the Ionic dialect to his native idiom in the composition of his work, can be considered in itself as no evidence of his alienation from

[1] I. 144.

[2] VII. 99., VIII. 87. sqq. 101. sqq.

Dorian tastes and habits. But he exhibits, in so many parts of his work, and in so marked a manner, that alienation, combined with so many feelings and associations proper to the rival Attico-Ionian races, that we are the less surprised to find him expatriating himself altogether, and identifying his nationality with that of the Athenians as a denizen of one of their chief colonial settlements.

His settlement at Thurium.

A more specific reason for this estrangement from the land of his birth has been assigned by Suidas; a compiler of a very low period and slender credit, but who supplies the only details that have been transmitted of the historian's early personal history. According to this authority, "his father was called Lyxas[1], his mother Dryo; both members of noble Halicarnassian families. He had also a brother called Theodorus. Driven from his native city by the tyrant Lygdamis, grandson of Artemisia, he took refuge in Samos, where he acquired the Ionic dialect, and in it composed his history in nine books. On his return to Halicarnassus, he succeeded in expelling Lygdamis. Finding, however, that his services in the cause of liberty were little appreciated by his fellow-citizens, he joined the Athenians as a colonist of Thurium. There he died, and was buried in the market-place. Others, however, assert that he died at Pella."[2]

In another supplementary notice by the same author, we are told that Herodotus "was nephew according to some, first cousin according to others,

[1] So also Lucian, de Domo, 21.; and the Epigram ap. Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 331., and Steph. Byz. v. Θούριος. Tzetzes, Chil. i. 19., calls his father Oxylus.

[2] Suid. v. Ἡρόδοτος.

of the epic poet Panyasis; and that the latter was slain by the same tyrant Lygdamis whom Herodotus afterwards dethroned." [1]

These particulars, as resting on the sole authority of Suidas, and unnoticed by any previous writer among the many who allude to the personal affairs of the historian, can advance, at best, but small pretensions to authenticity. That the account of the completion of his work at Samos is false, there can be very little doubt: and considering how sedulously the Greeks of the republican age were used to record the exertions and sacrifices of comparatively obscure patriots in the cause of constitutional freedom, it were very unaccountable that these, the only remarkable traits in the political life of so very remarkable a character as Herodotus, should never have been mentioned by any author of earlier date or better credit than Suidas. These considerations render it more probable, that the account of his early political adventures is a fiction invented to explain his retirement to Thurium, than that his retirement to Thurium was a consequence of any such political adventures. A legend of this nature were the more likely to spring up, had Panyasis, his contemporary and fellow-citizen, really been also his cousin, and a victim, to so much more cruel an extent than himself, of the same tyrannical oppression. But the doubts of the genuine character of either tradition, — for both rest on the same weak authority, — are perhaps rather confirmed by the connexion into which the two celebrated Halicarnassians are thus brought with each other; a

[1] Suid. v. Πανύασις.

connexion savouring at least as much of the artifice of biographical fable as of the reality of literary history. But although there may not be authentic evidence of Herodotus himself having suffered in the cause of republican liberty, we have good proof of his favour to free constitutional government, both in the general tone of his political allusions, and in the pointed terms in which he describes the rapid advance of his patroness Athens in prosperity as an immediate consequence of her return to democratic forms after the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ.[1] The account of his residence in Samos is also, apart from those apocryphal details, indirectly confirmed by the intimate knowledge which he shows of the topography of the island, and the apparent pleasure which he takes in dwelling on its affairs. From the undue prominence which on one occasion he assigns[2] in his narrative to a certain Samian namesake of his own, an otherwise altogether obscure personage, it has also been not without plausibility inferred, that a portion of his family may have been settled at Samos.

Epoch of his birth.

The most specific extant notice of the historian's age by any secondary authority, is that cited by Aulus Gellius[3] from a work of Pamphila, a female polyhistor in the time of Nero. According to her Herodotus was fifty-three years old at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, in 431 B. C. Admitting the correctness of this statement, he would have been born in 484 B. C., five years prior to the close of the Persian war; and if, as appears from his own text, he was alive and writing his history after the year 408 B. C., he could hardly have been much

[1] v. 66. [2] VIII. 132. [3] X. 23.

short of eighty, and may probably have been past that age, at the time of his death. Pamphila further described Hellanicus in the same year 431 B.C. as sixty-five years of age, consequently twelve years older than Herodotus; and Thucydides as forty, consequently thirteen years younger than Herodotus. Little weight can attach to the authority of an obscure female writer of the Roman period, referring to no prior testimony; and we have already seen that in respect to Hellanicus her data can hardly be correct. For the life of that author was prolonged, as we learn from his own text, till near the close of the fifth century B. C.: so that had he been sixty-five years old in 431, he would have been past ninety at the epoch of his death, instead of eighty-five, the utmost assigned him even by Lucian in his specimens of extreme human longevity. In regard however to Herodotus, the notice tallies sufficiently well with the tenor of his own indirect allusions, to admit of our receiving it as at least a near approximation to the truth, but not of our adopting it as a standard epoch with the same implicit confidence which some biographers of the historian have reposed in it.[1]

Tradition of his recital of his work at Olympia.

4. But the most celebrated chapter in the legendary life of Herodotus, is that which describes his recital of his work before the assembled public of Greece at Olympia, and the effect produced by his narrative on the youthful mind of Thucydides. The only writer with pretensions to the character of a classic who mentions this story is Lucian. In order

[1] See supra, p. 217. note 7. Conf. Dion. Hal. Jud. de Thuc. 5. For other secondary authorities of less weight, see Bähr's Vit. Herodot. in vol. iv. of his edition, 1835; Voss de Histt. Gr. iv. 1.

rightly to estimate the value of his authority, and the general merits of the much controverted question which his statements involve, a concise abstract is here subjoined of the passage of his work in which they are contained:

"The historian, having brought his great work to maturity in his native Asiatic home, took counsel with himself as to the mode in which he should obtain for it that celebrity to which he felt conscious it was entitled. As the best means of securing this object he resolved, instead of visiting in their turn the principal Hellenic cities, such as Athens, Corinth, Argos, and Lacedæmon, to attend the great Olympian festival, which was then at hand, and to which the most distinguished men of all parts of Greece were in the habit of resorting. Thither accordingly he proceeded; and on the day and hour when the assembly was at its full, he took up his post on the platform of the Temple of Jupiter, and recited his composition aloud to the assembled Greeks. The effect was immediate and complete. The delighted audience hailed the nine books into which the work was divided, by the title of the nine Muses, which they have ever since enjoyed. From that moment the celebrity of their author was such as to throw into the shade even that of the victors in the games. There was henceforth no man in Greece so ignorant as not to know the name of Herodotus. For those who had been present at the feast pointed him out whichever way he bent his steps, as the Herodotus who had celebrated, in purest Ionian style, our glorious victories over the Persian invaders. Not only was his renown publicly proclaimed by the heralds in the great national assembly, but every in-

dividual state hastened to bestow on him its own separate tribute of gratitude and praise."[1]

In a supplementary account transmitted by Suidas, it is said that "Thucydides, then a boy, was present with his father Olorus at the festival, and that he shed tears on listening to the recital of Herodotus; upon which the latter, addressing himself to Olorus, congratulated him on the possession of a son whose zeal for knowledge displayed itself at so early an age, and in so interesting a manner."[2]

The simple question, whether Herodotus did or did not read his work at Olympia, may not on first view appear of such vital importance in its bearings on his own history, as to require any detailed discussion of it on the part of his biographer. It has however acquired that degree of importance, from the efforts made by the vindicators of Lucian's veracity to force the more authentic notices of the historian's life into harmony with the apocryphal details of the Olympian anecdote, instead of testing the value of that anecdote by other better data. The result has been to invest those more authentic notices with an air of improbability, or even to set them aside altogether. While on these accounts a further consideration of the question is necessary, it may also tend to throw some additional light on various points, both of the speculative biography of the historian, and of the literary habits of his age.

The substance of Lucian's account is: First, that Herodotus, having composed his history in his native town of Halicarnassus, proceeded direct to Olympia,

[1] Lucian, Herodotus, 1. sq.

[2] Suid. vv. Θουκυδ. and Ὀργῇν; Marcellin. Vit. Thuc.; Phot. Bibl. cod. LX.

and recited it aloud at the festival in its existing state of integrity, divided into nine books or Muses, as we now possess it: secondly; that from the day on which this recital took place, both author and work acquired that high national celebrity and popularity which they ever afterwards continued to enjoy.

Historical objections to that tradition.

A preliminary objection which offers itself to the authenticity of this story, is the circumstance that Lucian should be the first author who relates it, or even alludes to the bare tradition on which it may have been founded. Had any such tradition been current in the Greek public during the six centuries between the age of Herodotus and that of Lucian, it seems most unlikely that no allusion whatever should have been made by any previous author to an event of so great interest in the annals of polite literature. This objection might not be insuperable, were Lucian's account probable in itself, or consistent with the more authentic notices of the historian's life. But so little is this the case, that all the details of the anecdote have been admitted to be false, even by the more candid of those who uphold the truth of the main fact to which they suppose those details to be subsidiary.

The first of the two general heads of Lucian's statement, that Herodotus completed the nine books of his history in his native city before visiting Europe, is contradicted by Pliny[1], an earlier and much more credible witness in any such case; who asserts that the historian's work was written at Thurium, after his final expatriation from Halicarnassus. Whatever may be the intrinsic value of Pliny's testimony in regard to the fact here stated, the statement itself is

[1] XII. 4.

conclusive proof that Pliny had never heard, or if he had heard, did not believe in a previous recital of the work at Olympia; and it is not very likely that so inquisitive and gossiping a compiler should have been ignorant of the Lucianic story, had it been already current in his day. There are also, it need scarcely be added, in the historian's own text, numerous passages[1] allusive to events of later date than the author's settlement in his Italian domicile; some of which bear, as we have seen, internal evidence of having been composed in Italy. It is true that the argument from internal evidence cannot here justly be considered so conclusive as it has been by several able objectors to the Lucianic tradition. There is much in the general character of the historian's work to warrant the belief, that it neither was written out continuously from an already prepared stock of materials, as a modern work of the kind usually is written, nor presented, even when brought into an integral form, at once to the public. After a first draught was embodied, it may probably have remained on the author's hands, receiving from time to time such additions as his more extended study or experience enabled him to supply.[2] The occurrence, therefore, of passages referring to more recent events, would in itself be no conclusive evidence that the work had not been circulated in a less mature state at an earlier period. But any such publication of successive editions is as little supported by historical evidence as the Olympic lecture; and were a fact of too great importance in the life of Herodotus, or the history of Greek literature, to be arbitrarily assumed

[1] See note to p. 245. supra.

[2] This seems indeed to be stated by himself in IV. 30.

merely for the purpose of imparting a plausible air to the fables of Lucian. That author's further description of the history as having been, at the epoch of its supposed recital, already divided by Herodotus into its existing nine books, has been freely admitted to be false, even by the keenest modern vindicators of Lucian's general veracity; who have not hesitated to recognise in this distribution of the text the work of some grammarian of a subsequent age.

The assertion of Lucian, that from the epoch of the Olympic recital the historian's fame and popularity were spread over all Greece, is repugnant to the spirit of the entire Greek literature of the age of Herodotus, and of that which immediately followed. Neither orator nor sophist, neither poet nor philosopher; neither Aristophanes, nor, in so far as we have insight into their works, the contemporary comedians, in those burlesque allusions in which they delighted to the living standards of the national literature; neither Plato nor other graver authors, in their citations from those standards, have left a trace of any such fame or popularity having as yet been enjoyed by Herodotus. With one single exception, no writer prior to Aristotle, who flourished more than half a century after the death of Herodotus, is known to have so much as mentioned his name, or otherwise betrayed a knowledge of his existence. The exception is Ctesias[1], his later contemporary, who,

[1] Persica, frg. 29. § 1. 57. (pp. 45. 57.) Didot. If the passage of Thucydides (i. 20.), relative to the votes of the Spartan kings and to the Pitanite corps of the Spartan army, is to be considered as levelled at Herodotus (vi. 57., ix. 52.), which is certainly a reasonable assumption, it would supply an additional evidence that the early reception of the latter historian's work was not one of universal approbation. The notion that another passage of Thucydides (i. 22. in fine) also contains a sneer at Herodotus appears somewhat farfetched.

it is also remarkable, quotes the historian for the purpose, not of eulogising, but condemning his statements. This silence of the contemporaneous public is certainly a strong argument that the promulgation of the history did not take place till a late period of the author's life, possibly not till after his death. Nor is there wanting authority for such posthumous publication[1]; authority, indeed, of little intrinsic value; but which can hardly in the present case be considered inferior to that of Lucian on the opposite side.

Its intrinsic improbability.

5. Apart from these historical considerations, the physical improbability, to say the least, of such an Olympian recital of any similar work, even in the less mature form in which Lucian's advocates assume it to have existed at the supposed date of the ceremony, goes far in itself to evict the falsehood of his story The Olympic festival was, neither in respect to its object nor its locality, adapted to such performances. It was celebrated at midsummer, during the heat of a Greek solstice, the time of the year most favourable in all countries, at appropriate hours of the day, to gymnastic exercises, but least favourable to literary declamation. Nor does allusion occur in any author to a place destined for the latter purpose, under any one of the numerous titles, Lesche, Tholus, Museum, &c., by which such public saloons were known in Greece; and it is hardly to be supposed, had recitals of this kind formed an ordinary part of the Olympic entertainments, that some such accommodation would have been wanting.[2]

[1] Ptol. Heph. ap. Phot. cod. 189. p. 477.

[2] Since the above remarks were written, we have obtained access to the subjoined passage of an antient grammarian, containing evidence,

Even had the season of the year been propitious, an author of common sense would hardly have thought of rhapsodising in the open air, to a miscellaneous crowd, a prose work, replete with geographical and statistical details, such as even in the most convenient form of lecture were little calculated to fix the attention of any but the more intellectual part of a Greek audience. Lucian's description of Herodotus, as standing on the hinder platform of the temple, with book in hand, "chanting" aloud to the multitude scattered over the surrounding plain, is so palpably absurd, as to prove that its author did not believe the particulars of his own story.

Lucian, in the same tract, mentions Hippias, Prodicus, Anaximenes, and Polus, as having been encouraged by the example of Herodotus to become competitors for literary fame on the same Olympic arena; and his authority is here supported by older and better testimonies.[1] Nothing, indeed, were more natural than that these professional sophists or rhetoricians, who, in so far as professional, were almost

both that the Lucianic legend was not generally acquiesced in by its author's own contemporaries or successors, and also that, among the principal objections urged against it by its opponents, were those last stated in the text, the extreme heat of the season and the want of proper accommodation:

"Εἰς τὴν Ἡροδότου σκιάν·" ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ τελεσιουργούντων ἃ προσείλοντο. Φασὶ γὰρ Ἡρόδοτον τὸν λογογράφον, Ὀλυμπιάσι δεῖξαι βουληθέντα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἱστορίαν, ἀναβάλλεσθαι ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, φάσκοντα, σκιᾶς εἰ ἐπιλάβοιτο ἐν τῷ τεμένει τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου δείξειν τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ἔστι γὰρ δεινῶς προσήλιον τὸ χωρίον. Ἔλαθεν οὖν αὐτὸν διαλυθεῖσα ἡ πανήγυρις οὐκ ἐπιδειξάμενον τὰς ἱστορίας. Montfauc. Bibl. Coisl. cod. CLXXVII. p. 609.

[1] Plat. Hipp. Min. p. 363.; Cic. de Orat. III. 32.; Philostr. Vit. Soph. I. ix. 1., conf. Epist. XIII.; Pausan. VI. xvii. 5.; Dion. Hal. de Lys. Jud. 29.; Athenæ. XIV. p. 620., who would hardly have laid so much stress on the rhapsodising of the history of Herodotus by Hegesias at Alexandria, had he been aware that Herodotus himself had rhapsodised it at Olympia.

always itinerant, should select Olympia at the time of the games as a convenient theatre for their exhibitions. Nor probably would they have had difficulty in finding in the contiguous towns, or even within the sacred precinct, a convenient place for the purpose. But the circumstance that these more reasonable accounts refer to works of an altogether different character from that of Herodotus, to works the recital of which on such occasions was both practicable and natural, tends but to place in a stronger light the impracticability of any such performance in the case of the historian. The popular essays of these itinerant lecturers, while specially adapted for rhetorical declamation, might, judging from the specimens that have survived, have required, as a general rule, about half an hour for their delivery. The nine books of Herodotus could not have been similarly disposed of under an average of four hours each. Let us, however, as before, assume them to have been recited at the festival in less mature form, and to have required consequently but three hours each, in all twenty-seven hours. The festival lasted four, or at the utmost five days. Six or seven hours consequently, of each of those days, in the particular olympiad in which Lucian supposes Herodotus to have exhibited, would have been devoted to a prose lecture; a space of time comprising, if not the whole, certainly the greater part of the day disposable during the Greek solstice for any kind of bodily or mental exertion. The supposition that a festival properly devoted to gymnastic games should, on this single occasion, have been perverted to so different an object, added to the other difficulties of the case, forms a mass of improbabilities such as it were an injustice

to so clever a satirist as Lucian, to suppose he ever meant to offer to his public for anything else than pure literary romance.[1]

Even had there been no such obstacles to the delivery of this lecture, the work of Herodotus was perhaps, of all works of the kind, that least adapted to this mode of publication. Few national authors ever handled their subject in a manner so little calculated to gratify the vanity of a national audience. This is not the place to dwell in detail on the feature of its composition here referred to, a feature to be fully considered in treating of the characteristics at large of the author's genius, one of the most honourable of which was his rigid impartiality, and unsparing castigation of the errors or crimes of his own countrymen.[2] It may here suffice to remark, that the portion of his history particularised by Lucian as the source of that boundless panhellenic popularity which his Olympic lecture procured for him, his narrative of the great Persian war, was precisely that, the public recital of which was most calculated to wound the vanity and provoke the anger of a large portion of his fellow Greeks. Several leading members of the confederacy are there denounced as traitors, who had espoused the quarrel and fought in the ranks of the enemy; others, as lukewarm or doubtful adherents to the patriotic cause. Nor are the motives by which the remaining states, except perhaps Athens and Platæa, are represented as having been induced to remain true to the

[1] Lucian's contempt for historical truth, even in the ostensibly historical portions of his miscellany, and his ready resort to fiction wherever it suited the purpose of his sarcasm or his jest, have been ingeniously illustrated by Dahlman, with many apt citations from his text. Herodotus, § 7. p. 26. sqq.

[2] See Ch. vi. § 21. sqq.

national interest, or the mode in which they are described as exerting themselves in its support, so creditable, as to call forth towards the historian who proclaimed them very warm feelings of gratitude. There is indeed much reason to believe, that had Herodotus been so bold as to attempt this mode of publishing his work, or been gifted with such physical powers as to overcome the obstacles to his success, the consequence would have been an uproar in the assembly, ending perhaps in an assault on his person by one half of his audience, from which he would have been but coldly defended by the other. Nor is it likely that a man of so much good sense and kindly feeling would have had the bad taste to select the four days of national festivity, during which the intestine animosities of his countrymen were understood to be laid aside, as the occasion for publicly denouncing the treachery or cowardice of the fathers of a large portion of those to whom he addressed himself.

His work rose but slowly in popular estimation.

6. In fact, although the mature judgement of an enlightened posterity, and the innate spirit of candour which animates the historian's narrative, secured for him, on the subsidence of individual passions, the high character which he has so long enjoyed as an impartial investigator of truth, there can yet be little doubt, that owing to the above causes of unpopularity the reception of his work was at first comparatively cold, and that at all periods the national admiration of it was tempered with feelings of distrust or discontent in respect to portions of its contents. Such feelings lurk in many of the extant commentaries of Greek authors, which rarely express either admission or approbation of his impartiality, more frequently contain querulous imputations of inaccuracy or dis-

honesty. The attacks of Ctesias have already been noticed. In other malicious quarters Herodotus was accused of exacting bribes from the Greek states as the price of his honourable mention of them, or even of his abstaining from calumniating them in his page. He was specially charged with blackening the conduct of the Thebans[1], because they had not only refused him money, but warned him off their territory on account of his baseness in demanding it. The somewhat ambiguous tenor of his allusion to the part played by the Corinthians in the battle of Salamis, was attributed[2] to their refusal of a similar demand. The Athenians, on the other hand, were reported[3] to have presented him with ten talents, in reward of his having made them act so noble a part throughout the war of national defence. The tract of "Plutarch" on the Malignity of Herodotus, is a condensation of these calumnies, for as such they have been recognised by the intelligent public of every age removed from the prejudices in which they originate. Notices exist of other similar tracts no longer extant, under similar titles.[4] A work the contents of which were calculated to excite such bitter feelings, must have been singularly ill adapted for public recital to an audience composed in great part of those on whose honour it so seriously reflected.[5]

[1] Aristoph. Bœot. ap. Pseudo-Plut. de Mal. II. § 31.

[2] Dio Chrys. Orat. xxxvii. p. 456.

[3] Pseudo-Plut. § 26.

[4] Æl. Harpocration, ap. Suid. v. *Ἁρποκρατίων*. Pollis, apud Euseb. Præp. Ev. x. p. 467.; Manetho, ap. Smith, Biogr. Dict. II. p. 916., conf. Lucian. Ver. Hist. II. 31.; Aristot. de Gener. Anim. III. 5.; Strabo, p. 45. 62. 508. 531.; Josephus (contr. Ap. I. 3.); who after noticing the objections taken by one or other Greek writer to the authority of different native historians, adds, that "*all* agreed in denouncing the bad faith of Herodotus:" *Ἡρόδοτον δὲ πάντες ψευδόμενον ἐπιδεικνῦσι.*

[5] See Appendix H.

It seems then, that every particular of Lucian's narrative may be convicted of falsehood, either by its own improbability, or by its repugnance to the better-attested facts of the historian's life. It is therefore somewhat surprising, in this age of rational scepticism, when truth itself has often difficulty in emerging unscathed from the severe tests of critical alchemy to which it is daily subjected, to find so many intelligent commentators still insist in maintaining that a mass of parts, all or most of which are acknowledged by themselves to be individually false, should yet as a whole be substantially true.[1] Their argument is much to the subjoined effect: "Granting the Olympian recital of Lucian to be fabulous, it does not necessarily follow that an Olympian recital may not have taken place. Herodotus *may* have read at Olympia a first draught of his work, or a portion of it more easily comprised within the limits of time which the

[1] Bähr, Vit. Herod. vol. IV. edit. Lips. 1835; Heyse, de Herod. Vit. et itinn.; Kenrick, The Egypt of Herod. p. xiii. sqq.; Krüger, Unters. üb. das Leben des Thucyd. p. 24. sqq. The pains which the last-quoted author has taken to confute in detail the tradition which he adopts in the gross, is very surprising. The whole point of Lucian's narrative centres in his description of the historian's Olympic exhibition as being his first public appearance. Krüger assumes that it was the success of his previous exhibitions at Athens and Corinth which induced him to aim at distinction on a still higher sphere. According to the same critic the lecture to which Thucydides listened and wept was not that held at Olympia. These interesting tears he understands to have been shed in the dwelling of Olorus, father of Thucydides, to whom Herodotus, being on habits of intimacy with the family, was reading his book in a private friendly manner.

Bähr, op. cit. p. 398., after acquiescing in the popular view that Herodotus read his history about the year 456 B. C. and thus established the celebrity which Lucian describes it as ever afterwards enjoying, adopts in the sequel the opinion that Hellanicus the rival historian of the age, who was contemporaneous with Herodotus during some forty years afterwards, had never read or so much as heard of the work which had procured for its author so vast an ascendancy of fame and popularity over himself!

festival allowed. This portion he may have read to a select circle in some more convenient locality than the gymnastic arena. Instead of the Persian war, he may have selected some part less likely to give umbrage to any portion of his audience. This he may have done, not at the earlier date assigned by Lucian, but at some later epoch more compatible with the authentic records of his life." All this no doubt may have happened; but those who assume that it did happen, must do so on their own responsibility, not on the authority of Lucian, whose account is evicted of falsehood by every word of the above exposition of it. Nothing assuredly can be more at variance with the principles of sound criticism, than in a case where all the particulars of a story, in the shape in which it has been transmitted by its only narrator, are acknowledged to be false, to assume, in deference to some favourite prepossession of our own, that in some other shape it must have been true. History consists in the record of authenticated facts, not in the invention of probabilities to sustain the credit of popular falsifiers of its page.

The tears of Thucydides.

That the tears of Thucydides, celebrated by Suidas and other writers[1] of the Byzantine age, are a later fable, supplementary to Lucian's lecture of Herodotus, is abundantly clear. It is not very probable, had the former story been already current in the time of Lucian, that he would have neglected to avail himself of so valuable an ingredient of that rhetorical effect which he is so anxious to impart to his Olympic narrative. Nothing, on the other had, could be more conformable to the ordinary course of popular fiction

[1] Sup. citt. in p. 256.

in any such case, than that where Herodotus declaimed, as already an accomplished man, Thucydides should be present as an enthusiastic youth, to listen and inhale the genial inspiration of his illustrious predecessor.

Other public recitals:

Of the three other traditions of the historian's lectures, in Corinth, Thebes, and Athens, the first two are subsidiary to the stories current in later times of his exacting bribes from the Greek states. The

at Corinth,

Corinthian story will here be allowed to speak for itself, in the words of Dio Chrysostom[1], by whom it has been preserved. That rhetor, in a complimentary harangue addressed to the Corinthians, reminds them that "Herodotus, when on a visit to their city, recited to their forefathers a version of his account of the battle of Salamis, in which their conduct was fairly appreciated, and they and their commander Adimantus were described as distinguished for their valour. But on the same Herodotus demanding his fee, and on its being refused by the Corinthians, who disdained to make their glory a subject of barter or sale, he altered that portion of his narrative in such a manner as to place their conduct in a discreditable light." Those who admit the truth of the main fact which it is the object of this anecdote to promulgate, may also believe in the ancillary circumstance of the Corinthian lecture; but if the imputation against the historian's honesty be rejected as false, as it has been by all intelligent modern critics, the story of the lecture can

Thebes,

hardly be sustained as authentic. The details of the Theban anecdote are very similar. That such calumnies were for the most part of mere local circulation,

[1] Orat. xxxvii. p. 456.

may be inferred from the circumstance, that the charge of extorting money from the Corinthians finds no place in the Pseudo-Plutarch's catalogue of offences, from which it would hardly have been excluded had it reached the compiler's ears.

and Athens.

The account of the historian's recital of parts of his work at Athens has better claims to authenticity. It were as unreasonable to doubt that popular authors of the Periclean age were in the habit of reading their works aloud on appropriate occasions, as it were to assume, with more credulous modern commentators, that Herodotus was a sort of itinerant prose rhapsodist, who travelled from place to place to court applause and collect money from his audience. The extent, however, to which this mode of publication might be resorted to in particular cases, would depend much on the moral or physical habit of the individual author. A reserved or sensitive man might rarely, perhaps never, venture on any such exhibition. Nor was there any necessity for his putting a force on his inclinations. If his book was one of general interest, there would be no want of persons qualified for the office of reading it to those who were unable to provide themselves with copies, or of pecuniary inducement to the task. It is very probable that Herodotus may, in his adopted homes of Athens or Thurium, have availed himself of both these means of circulation. Nor, in repudiating the legends of his exaction of bribes at Thebes or Corinth, need we be precluded from crediting the account of a gift of ten talents having been bestowed by the state of Athens on the most illustrious of her naturalised citizens, in recognition of the services rendered to herself and the entire Hellenic nation, by the composition of his

great work. This fact was attested, if we may trust "Plutarch," by Dyillus, a native Attic historian of good credit during the Alexandrian period.[1]

Assyrian history of Herodotus.

7. The history which we now possess was the only work recognised by the critical public of antiquity as the genuine production of Herodotus. He appears however to have contemplated another, under the title of "Assyrian histories;" to which on several occasions[2] he refers the reader for further information on oriental subjects not fully treated in his existing text. No such work however is mentioned by any other author, although, had such a one been extant, it seems scarcely possible that it would have been overlooked by successive generations of quoters or commentators.[3] It were to be presumed, therefore, that the book, though planned, had not been completed; or, that if completed it remained unpublished. The terms of his own allusions are, indeed, such as to leave room for doubt whether it was intended as a

[1] Plut. de Malig. H. 26.: conf. Didot, Fragg. Histt. Gr. vol. II. p. 360. The details of this story are, however, somewhat confused. The lecture is described as taking place in 446 B.C. (Euseb. Chron. p. 169. ad Ol. 83.), before the author's settlement at Thurium; at which time his work probably was not yet written. The decree conferring the gift, on the other hand, is stated to have been proposed by Anytus, an Athenian statesman, who first appears in a prominent capacity towards the close of the Peloponnesian war, about 409 B.C. near thirty years after the supposed epoch of the lecture. (Smith, Biogr. Dict. I. p. 220.) If both lecture and decree be dated toward the end of the century, the notice would be in harmony with the view above adopted, chiefly on the authority of Herodotus himself, of the chronology of his life and labours. The date of Eusebius reflects, probably, some popular impression that the literary distinction enjoyed by Herodotus at Athens, during his previous residence in the city, was the cause of his staking his future fortunes as an Athenian colonist.

[2] I. 184.: conf. 106.

[3] In the passage of Aristotle, De Generat. An. VIII. 18., where such a work of "Herodotus" appeared to be cited, the true reading is now understood to be "Hesiodus." See Dahlmann, § 38.

separate work, or only as another of those longer episodes in which he indulges in his extant history, and which were probably inserted in their places at different intervals of time, in the progress of the text to its present state of maturity. It is scarcely necessary to add, that the tract on the life of Homer which passes familiarly current as a work of Herodotus, is acknowledged by the general consent of classical critics to possess no claim to that honour.

His death

There were various traditions relative to the death of the historian.[1] According to one he died at Thurium, and was buried in the market-place of that city; another placed his decease at Pella in Macedonia. The former account were the more probable of the two, but for the recorded fact that Thurium in 412 B.C. revolted from Athens, and that the old Athenian colonists who sided with the mother state were then driven into exile, when many of them, among others Lysias the orator, returned to Attica. Unless we assume Herodotus to have joined the insurgents, he may naturally be supposed to have followed the example of Lysias, and to have ended his days among his Attic protectors. This view is partially supported by the statement of Marcellinus, the biographer of Thucydides, that the tomb of Herodotus was shown at Athens. The legend of his death at Pella connects itself with another, of his having been a fellow-guest with Hellanicus at the court of Amyntas king of Macedon.[2]

and character.

Slender as are the data transmitted by the historian himself relative to the actual events of his life, his text will yet be found a copious source of

[1] Suid. v. Ἡρόδ.

[2] See note to p. 46. supra.

valuable materials for the illustration of his character both as a man and a writer. We have here another trait of analogy between Herodotus and Homer, in addition to those already noticed or to be pointed out in the sequel. Of the historian it may be said, with nearly the same truth as of the poet, that he lives for posterity but in the pages of his work; with this difference, however, that Homer lives in comparative seclusion, Herodotus in open and cheerful converse with his public and his age. By the data derived from this source, we shall be enabled to form no imperfect estimate of his moral, religious, and political principles; and of the temper and spirit in which he examined the varieties of men, manners, and things, which long experience and extensive travel had presented to his observation. By these data we shall be enabled to judge how far his reports of facts or events are to be considered as accurate and trustworthy; or, in the contrary case, how far he himself, how far the authorities on which he relied, are to be held responsible for his oversights or errors.

The proper place to examine in detail these materials for a full estimate of the historian's character, will be the ensuing analysis of his work. We shall here be content with a few general remarks which more obviously present themselves, as supplementary to the foregoing imperfect biographical sketch.

That Herodotus was, according to the standard of his age, a highly educated man, is abundantly evinced by the internal evidence of his elaborate work. His thorough knowledge of the poems of Homer, and the influence which their study exercised on his own art of composition, are apparent in the whole design of his history, in many appeals to their text, and in

many peculiarities of his own style and phraseology. That he was also versed in the compositions of other standard national classics appears from his familiar citation of Hesiod, the Cyclic poems[1], and the Arimaspea[2]; of Archilochus[3], Alcæus[4], Sappho[5], Solon[6], Æsop[7], Simonides[8], Pindar[9], Phrynichus[10], Æschylus.[11] Hecatæus[12] alone is quoted by name among preceding prose authors; but traces also occur of a familiarity with the works of other earlier logographers.[13] His mastery of his own language displays itself in every line of his narrative. It is also probable that he had been initiated, to however limited an extent, in those rhetorical and dialectic arts which, in his own time, rose and flourished chiefly in the parts of Hellas where he resided during his maturer years. His philological acquirements appear, however, to have been confined to his native tongue. His text offers no trace of an acquaintance with any foreign language, beyond the few words or phrases with which a visit to the country could hardly fail to render him familiar. Strange as may appear this indifference to a branch of science so peculiarly important to one who was not only a writer of foreign history, but a zealous traveller and geographer, it was a defect inherent in the genius of the age, rather than in that

[1] II. 53. 118., IV. 32. [2] IV. 14. [3] I. 12. [4] V. 95.
[5] II. 135. [6] v. 113. [7] II. 134. [8] V. 102., VII. 228.
[9] III. 38. [10] VI. 21. [11] II. 156.
[12] II. 143., VI. 137. alibi. The correspondence between one or two incidental facts or sentiments, in passages of Herodotus and Sophocles, affords no sufficient evidence of a personal acquaintance between the authors, or even of a knowledge of each other's works; the facts or sentiments being themselves precisely of a nature to have obtained popular currency in those days. Antigone, 909., conf. Herod. III. 119.; Œdip. Col. 339., conf. Herod. II. 35.
[13] Infra, Ch. V.

of the man, and to which attention has frequently been called in these pages. His attainments in natural science, while the result apparently of observation and experience rather than study, do not seem, even as referred to the standard of his day, to have been of a high order. As a practical geographer, indeed, he could have had few rivals; but his allusions to meteorological or astronomical phenomena show little or no advance beyond the popular notions of his age, and no very extended acquaintance with the more subtle but not perhaps better-founded speculations of contemporary philosophers.

The general tone of the historian's narrative, here as before our only genuine source of knowledge, indicates a man of amiable and honest heart, and independent spirit; feelingly alive to what is noble and generous, and averse to what is vicious and base in human character and conduct. His disapprobation of folly or vice is occasionally exhibited in a lively or even bitter vein of sarcasm, which seasons, without offensively alloying the prevailing kindliness of his language and sentiment. An example of this sarcastic turn has already been cited in our notice of his predecessor Hecatæus. While severe even to acrimony on that author, on account of his vanity as a man and his blunders as a historian, he does ample justice to his merits as a statesman and a patriot. His satirical humour also broadly displays itself in his judgements of the conduct of the several Greek states during the Persian war; portions of his text which have afforded to hostile critics opening for reasonable, if not valid, charges of partiality and malignity. The deep sense of the fundamental truths of natural religion, which animates every page of his

work, is curiously combined with an almost childish subjection to the popular superstition and credulity of his age and country. The cheerfulness of his narrative is also overcast at times by melancholy, or even gloomy, shades of moral sentiment, which imply that he was no stranger to the evils of life, though neither soured nor subdued by his experience of them. Among the passages in which his train of reflexion assumes this morbid tone, one is more especially remarkable[1], where he assures us, in such emphatic terms as to evince the thought to be his own though placed in the mouth of another, that "in this life, short as it is, there has never sojourned a man, however fortunate he may have appeared, but has had occasion, not once only but many times, to wish himself dead rather than alive."

In the case of Herodotus, as in that of Homer, it will be desirable, as the best foundation for a critical analysis of the work, to offer a compendious summary of its contents.

[1] VII. 46.

# CHAP. V.

## HERODOTUS: HIS WORK, AND ITS MATERIALS.

1. EPITOME OF THE TEXT. — 2. RESEARCH OF HERODOTUS. HOW TO BE CRITICALLY ESTIMATED. DEFINITION OF THE GREEK TERM Ἱστορίη, HISTORY. DIFFERENT KINDS OF HISTORICAL EVIDENCE. — 3. PERIOD OF HISTORY TREATED BY HERODOTUS. HIS NEGLECT OF THE MYTHICAL AGE. HIS HISTORICAL SOURCES. — 4. PREVIOUS HISTORIANS. HECATÆUS. XANTHUS. — 5. CHARON OF LAMPSACUS. HIPPYS. ANTIOCHUS. STESIMBROTUS. HELLANICUS. GEOGRAPHERS. — 6. MONUMENTAL RECORDS. ORAL TESTIMONY. — 7. MYTHICAL LEGEND, RULES FOR APPRECIATING ITS HISTORICAL VALUE. — 8. APPLICATION OF THOSE RULES TO THE NARRATIVE OF HERODOTUS. — 9. MYTHOLOGICAL MECHANISM OF EARLY PROSE HISTORY. LIFE OF CRŒSUS. DEATH OF ATYS. CRŒSUS ON THE PILE. BATTLE OF THYREA. — 10. FOREIGN HISTORY OF HERODOTUS, AND ITS SOURCES. ASSYRIAN HISTORY. — 11. MEDIAN HISTORY. — 12. EGYPTIAN HISTORY. — 13. SUDDEN TRANSITION FROM MYTHICAL TO REAL IN THE EGYPTIAN ANNALS. BLENDING OF EGYPTIAN AND GREEK MYTHOLOGY. GEOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH OF HERODOTUS.

### Book I.

Epitome of the text.

1. THE historian explains the object of his work to be: To preserve the memory of past events; to secure for the great actions of both Greeks and Barbarians their just meed of renown; and to trace the causes and course of the wars waged between the Asiatic and Hellenic races.

He first concisely notices the early fabulous adventures to which the popular voice ascribed the origin of those national quarrels; the Rape of the Argive Io by the Phœnicians; of the Phœnician Europa by the Cretans; of Medea of Colchis by the Argonauts; and of Helen of Sparta by Paris. Passing on to the realities of more recent history, he describes the conquest of the Greek republics of Asia minor by Crœsus king of Lydia, as the first authentically recorded act of aggression by a Barbarian power against the Hellenes. A few details of early Lydian history are subjoined.[1]

The most antient royal dynasty of that country was founded by

[1] 1—6.

Lydus son of Atys. From the last of his successors the kingdom passed to Agron, son of Belus, and fourth in descent from Hercules. Candaules, the last Heraclid sovereign, was deposed, and his throne usurped by Gyges, chief of the race called Mermnadæ. From this Gyges Crœsus was the fourth king in lineal descent.[1]

Several of the predecessors of Crœsus had made war on the Greek states, but with little success. The benefits derived by the Milesians, during their contest with Alyattes father of Crœsus, from the wise counsels of Periander of Corinth, are described, and the celebrated maritime adventure of Arion of Lesbos, court musician of Periander, is related.[2]

Under Ardys son of Gyges, the Cimmerians had invaded Lydia and burnt Sardis. They retained portions of the Lydian territory until finally expelled by Alyattes.

Crœsus subdues the Hellenic colonies of Asia minor, with the whole of that country west of the river Halys. He is visited by Solon the Athenian legislator, who had voluntarily subjected himself to ten years' exile, after the promulgation of his code in his native city.[3] The prosperity of Crœsus is suddenly clouded over by the death of a favourite son.[4] He is roused from his grief by alarm at the conquests of Cyrus the Persian, who had already dethroned Astyages sovereign of the neighbouring empire of Media. After consulting the most celebrated oracles of the time, he determines on attacking Cyrus before his power should receive further increase; and courts the alliance of Athens and Lacedæmon, then the two leading states of European Greece.[5] Some account is given of the origin and early history of each of these commonwealths. The Athenians, a Pelasgian race and indigenous in their present seats, had lately, in order to escape the turbulence of internal faction, which even the wise legislation of Solon had not sufficed to allay, become willing victims of the tyranny of Pisistratus, chief of the democratic party, who now ruled them with firm, but mild and prudent sway. The Lacedæmonians, a Dorian race of Pindus, governed by a family of Heraclid princes, had, after various wanderings in northern Greece, subdued, in conjunction with other kindred Dorian tribes, the greater part of Peloponnesus. Not long after their settlement in their new territory, they were raised by the wise legislation of Lycurgus from a state of semibarbarous anarchy to a political ascendancy over the neighbouring states. At this time they had

[1] 6—13. [2] 14—25. [3] 26—33. [4] 34—45. [5] 46—55.

just brought to a successful close a long war against the Arcadians of Tegea. The Lydian king's offers of alliance are accepted by them.[1]

The animosity of Crœsus against Cyrus had been increased by the circumstance, that Astyages the Mede, whose empire had been overthrown by the Persian chief, was his brother-in-law. This alliance had been the result of a war between Alyattes father of Crœsus and Cyaxares father of Astyages, which terminated in a drawn battle; the two armies, overawed by a sudden eclipse of the sun, the same foretold by Thales of Miletus, having simultaneously desisted from the combat. A peace ensued, and was ratified by the marriage of Astyages the crown-prince of Media to a daughter of Alyattes.[2]

Crœsus marches against Cyrus, and after a battle of doubtful issue retreats to Sardis, with the intention of renewing the campaign in the ensuing spring. He is followed by Cyrus, defeated in another battle, and besieged in his capital. The Lacedæmonians, who after the first embassy of Crœsus had carried on a successful war against the Argives, are about to send succours to Crœsus, when they hear of the capture of Sardis by Cyrus. Crœsus is made prisoner, and in his captivity enjoys the friendship and confidence of his conqueror.[3] The historian, after closing this part of his subject with some special remarks on the geography of Lydia, on the manners and religion of its inhabitants, and on the Tyrrhenian colony established by them in Italy[4], takes a retrospective view of the rise of the Persian power.

In the five hundred and twenty-first year of the old Assyrian empire, its Median provinces revolt, and establish themselves as a separate state, the sovereignty of which is conferred on a popular citizen named Deïoces. Cyaxares, the second king in descent from Deïoces, subdues the greater part of Asia; but his empire is overrun in its turn by a swarm of Scythian invaders. These barbarians penetrate through Asia to the frontiers of Egypt; but are bribed by Psammetichus king of that country to retire from his frontier. After a twenty-eight years' possession of central Asia they are again expelled by Cyaxares. To him succeeds Astyages, who, warned by a dream that the offspring of his daughter Mandane would supplant him on the throne of Media, gave her in marriage to a man of low estate but honourable birth named Cambyses, a native of Persia, then one of the tributary

[1] 56—70. [2] 71—74. [3] 75—92. [4] 93—94.

provinces of the Median empire. Mandane bears a son, who is named Cyrus. Astyages orders the child to be put to death, but his life is saved through the humanity of the officer charged with his destruction. On attaining manhood, Cyrus conspires with his Persian fellow-subjects against the Median supremacy, dethrones Astyages, and reigns in his stead.[1] A few remarks are added on the Persian manners and customs, civil and religious.[2]

After the conquest of Lydia, the states of the Ionian and Æolian confederacies, with the exception of Miletus, refuse submission to the Persian authority. A description is given of these states; of their settlement by the sons of the Athenian Codrus; of their territory, dialect, and habits; and of the neighbouring Dorian colonies to the south. On the departure of Cyrus for Ecbatana, Pactyas, a Lydian whom he had appointed treasurer of the Sardian province, makes a vain attempt to excite a revolt among his Lydian countrymen against the Persian government.[3] Harpagus, the lieutenant of Cyrus, reduces the Greek states. The great body of the inhabitants of Phocæa abandon that city before its capture, with their ships and valuables, and sailing westward, after various piratical adventures found the colony of Velia on the coast of Italy. The Lycians and Carians are also subdued by Harpagus. Their country and manners are described.[4]

Cyrus, having reduced all the western parts of Asia, invades and conquers Babylonia, which had maintained its separate independence against the Medes. A detailed description is given of this country; of its antient metropolis, its river Euphrates, and its great fertility and wealth; with some account of its early history, religion, laws, and customs.[5]

Cyrus next directs his arms against the Massagetæ, a race dwelling on the plains beyond the Caspian sea, and governed by a queen called Tomaris, to whom Cyrus makes proposals of marriage. She refuses his offer, and a war ensues, in which the Persians are defeated and Cyrus is slain.[6]

## Book II.

Cyrus is succeeded by his son Cambyses, the first act of whose reign is an expedition against Egypt.

To the description of that country the whole of this book is

[1] 95—130. [2] 131—140. [3] 141—161.
[4] 162—176. [5] 177—200. [6] 201—216.

devoted. The historian enlarges on the singularity of its geographical features, and on the many marvels which it offered to the attention of the curious traveller. He defines its boundaries, with the primeval formation and gradual increase of its soil, from the alluvial deposit of the Nile.[1] He describes the course of that river in so far as explored, and relates the traditions current regarding its origin, with the researches that had been undertaken to trace its fountain head in the interior of Africa. He speculates on the causes of its annual overflow, and reports the conflicting theories on the subject, inclusive of his own opinion.[2] He describes the rare plants and animals which the country produced, the laws by which it was governed, the different orders or castes into which its inhabitants were divided. He enlarges on their early progress and great proficiency in the useful and ornamental arts, sciences, and manufactures; on their modes of writing, and of embalming their dead; on their public monuments, tombs, temples, pyramids, obelisks, labyrinths, canals; on their ships, and on the navigation and commerce of their great river. He enters into similar details regarding their religious belief and superstitious observances; the origin, names, and attributes of their gods; their animal worship, oracles, festivals, and funeral solemnities; and examines the traditions concerning the influence exercised by Egypt on the religion, manners, and institutions of other countries.[3] A sketch is also given of the civil history of the Egyptian empire, extending over a period of 360 generations of kings, and 11,500 years of time, from its founder Menes to the reigning king Amasis. Special notices are bestowed on the lives and actions of the more distinguished sovereigns; on their wars and conquests, and other remarkable events of their reigns.[4] Under Psammetichus the fourth predecessor of Amasis, Egypt had been first freely opened to foreign intercourse, and Greek and Phœnician colonies allowed to settle in its interior.[5] Amasis had been raised to the throne by an insurrection of the army against his predecessor Apries, who had rendered himself unpopular by acts of violence. The reign of Amasis, which had already lasted forty years, had been mild, just, and prudent; and under him the country was believed to have attained its highest state of internal wealth and prosperity.[6]

[1] 1—19. [2] 19—35. [3] 35—98.
[4] 99—150. [5] 151—171. [6] 172—182.

## Book III.

The cause or pretext of the hostile designs of Cambyses was resentment for an insult offered to him by Amasis, whose daughter he had asked in marriage. Amasis, fearing that the damsel would be treated more like a concubine than a queen, yet unwilling to offend his powerful neighbour, sends, in her assumed character, a daughter of the deposed king Apries. Cambyses discovers, and determines to revenge the fraud., ,Securing the cooperation of the Arab tribes, he advances upon Egypt by way of Palestine, and across the isthmus between the Mediterranean and the Red sea. The geographical features of that region are described.[1] Shortly before the Persian army reaches the Egyptian frontier, Amasis dies, and is succeeded by his son Psammenitus, who marches against the invader. A great battle ensues in which Psammenitus is defeated. His kingdom is conquered and annexed to the Persian dominions. The Libyan tribes to the westward, with the Greek colonies of Cyrene and Barca, send gifts and offers of allegiance to Cambyses.[2]

He plans three new conquests of African nations; of the Ethiopians on the upper Nile; of the Ammonians in the western desert; and of the Carthaginians. The latter enterprise is abandoned, on account of the refusal of the Phœnician mariners, who at this time formed the entire naval force of the Persians, to wage war against their African kinsmen.[3] The country and habits of the Ethiopian race are described. Cambyses divides his forces at Thebes into two armies; one of which he conducts in person against the Ethiopians; and sends the other against the Ammonians. His own armament, owing to the mad precipitancy of its leader, and his want of preparation for a march through an inhospitable country, perishes in great part from fatigue and famine. Cambyses, with the remnant that survives, has difficulty in effecting his retreat into Egypt. The force dispatched against the Ammonians is destroyed in the sands of the desert.[4]

The natural violence of the king's temper is aggravated by these disasters to a pitch of maniac fury, which he at first vents in outrages against the mysteries of the Egyptian religion. Soon after, having dreamt that his brother Smerdis, whom he had banished from his court through jealousy of his martial accom-

[1] 1—9. [2] 10—16. [3] 17—20. [4] 20—26.

plishments, was destined to supplant him on the throne, he causes him to be put to death. He also marries several of his sisters, contrary to the Persian law, murders one of them, and commits many other ferocious acts.[1]

While these things were passing in Egypt, refugees from Samos apply to the Spartan government for aid against Polycrates, who had usurped and now exercised despotic power in that island. The Lacedæmonians accede to their request, and fit out an armament against Polycrates. The Corinthians also send a force in aid of the enterprise, having an old quarrel with Samos on account of favour shown by that state in the time of their late sovereign Periander, to their rivals the Corcyræans; the particulars of these past transactions are narrated. The expedition is unsuccessful. The Spartans return home, and the Samian refugees form piratical settlements on various islands of the Mediterranean.[2]

One of the Magi, or Perso-Median priesthood, called Smerdis, whose brother Patizithes had been appointed governor of Susa by the king during his absence, proclaims himself to be Smerdis son of Cyrus, who had escaped the attempt made on his life by Cambyses. The king is about to march against the impostor, but is prevented by his own death, caused by a wound accidentally inflicted with his sword when mounting his horse. The mass of the Persian nation transfers its allegiance to Smerdis, believing him to be the true prince. Certain of the nobles however, detecting the fraud, conspire against the offender, who is slain, together with his accomplice Patizithes, after a valiant defence. One of the conspirators, Darius, of the royal blood of the Achæmenidæ, is chosen successor to Cambyses.[3]

The new sovereign divides the Persian empire into twenty satrapies. An account is given of these provinces, of their geographical peculiarities, and of the nature and amount of the annual tribute paid by each to the crown.[4]

Shortly before the accession of Darius, Orœtes, viceroy of Sardis, had entrapped Polycrates of Samos on friendly pretences into his province, and hanged him on a lofty gibbet. Democedes of Croto, state physician of Polycrates, and the most skilful practitioner of his time, who had accompanied his patron on this journey, is seized by the same Orœtes and thrown into prison. Soon after Orœtes himself, having been guilty of other outrageous acts, is

[1] 27—38. [2] 39—60. [3] 61—87. [4] 88—119.

put to death by order of Darius.[1] In the sequel the king dismounting hurriedly from his horse dislocates his ankle joint. Unable to procure relief from his own surgeons he has recourse to the skill of Democedes, whom he releases from his prison, transports to Susa, and retains in his service. Democedes, an unwilling exile from his native Hellas, engages Atossa the queen, in grateful return for the benefits conferred by his healing arts on herself and lord, to procure him the means of restoration to his home. This she effects by inducing Darius to send him as guide and interpreter to a royal commission, about to be dispatched by sea to Greece, to examine and report on the state of that country, with a view to its future invasion. While the vessel lay off Tarentum on the coast of Italy, Democedes escapes to Croto. His fellow-navigators, after vain attempts to recapture him, and sundry disasters involving the loss of their ship, return to Susa; having been the first Persians who had yet set foot in Hellas.[2]

Darius, in grateful remembrance of services conferred on him before his accession to the throne by Syloson brother of Polycrates, sends an armament to conquer Samos, with the purpose of conferring on Syloson the sovereignty of the island, lately enjoyed by his slain brother. The Persian troops, irritated by the resistance of the Samians, ravage the island and exterminate the population.[3] About this time the Babylonians revolt from Darius; but their city, after a spirited resistance, is reduced, and the province restored to its obedience.[4]

## Book IV.

Darius undertakes an expedition against the Scythians, in revenge of their antient inroads on the Median empire. The traditions relative to the origin and early vicissitudes of those races are narrated. After some notice of the travels of Aristeas of Proconnesus in the Hyperborean regions, a description is given of the country, religion, and manners of the Scythians proper and other neighbouring tribes real or fabulous. A general summary follows of the historian's views of the structure and geography of the earth, in so far as yet explored; with some account of the more remarkable maritime enterprises by which geographical science had been extended.[5]

[1] 120—128. [2] 129—138. [3] 139—149.
[4] 150—160. [5] 1—82.

The more prudent of the king's counsellors vainly endeavour to dissuade him from risking his army in those inhospitable regions. He crosses the Thracian Bosphorus by a bridge of boats, and sends a fleet of Ionian ships, with instructions to its commanders to sail up the Danube and prepare a similar bridge for the passage of that river. Traversing Thrace, he subdues the tribes through whose territory his march lay, and of whose manners the usual notices are supplied. On crossing the Danube he leaves the Ionians in guard of the bridge; and with the rest of his force advances into Scythia. The Scythians, avoiding collision with the main body of their invaders, retire into the interior, followed by Darius, who vainly attempts to force them to a battle. After wandering several months in the desert, harassed by the desultory warfare of his cunning adversary, he retreats on the bridge. Miltiades of Athens, lord of the Thracian Chersonesus, proposes to his fellow Greek chiefs to cut away the bridge, leave Darius to his fate, and avail themselves of the opportunity to emancipate the Ionian states from the Persian yoke. This proposal, at the instance of Histiæus of Miletus, is rejected; and Darius, with the remains of his army, recrosses the river in safety.[1]

Simultaneously with the Scythian expedition, a Persian armament had been fitted out in Egypt for the conquest of Libya. An account is given of the first discovery of Libya by the Greeks, and of the foundation of the Spartan colonies of Cyrene and Barca in its north-western district:

Not long after the Dorian occupation of Peloponnesus, Hellenes from Lemnos, descendants of the Minyan Argonauts the antient colonists of the island, had, when driven from it by Pelasgian invaders, taken shelter in Sparta and acquired the right of citizenship in that state: afterwards, having been convicted of seditious practices, they are allowed, in commutation of the capital punishment to which they were amenable, to embark as members of the colony then about to be settled by Theras, a Spartan hero of Cadmean origin, in the island subsequently named, after himself, Thera. The descendants of these Theræan colonists receive an order from the Delphic oracle to establish, under the guidance of Battus, a Spartan, but himself of Minyad origin, other settlements in Libya, of which country hitherto neither the situation nor the name was known to the Greeks. Having, with difficulty, discovered where Libya lay, they founded first the city and state of Cyrene,

[1] 83—144.

of which Battus became king. Another Battus, the third in descent from the founder, defeats Apries king of Egypt who had invaded his territory. A malecontent brother of Arcesilaus the sixth king founds the colony of Barca, in the same region of Libya. Arcesilaus himself is expelled from Cyrene with his mother Pheretime, and takes refuge in Samos. Collecting a force in that island he returns, destroys his enemies, and reestablishes his authority; but is slain soon after by the citizens of Barca. Pheretime, flying to Egypt, supplicates aid from Aryandas satrap of that country, on the ground of her deceased son's steady allegiance to the Persian interest. Aryandas fits out an expedition accordingly, with the two-fold object of avenging the cause of Pheretime and effecting the conquest of Libya. A detailed description is given of that country and of its numerous tribes of inhabitants.[1]

The Persian commander Amasis obtains possession of Barca by a stratagem. He inflicts punishment on the murderers of Arcesilaus and the enemies of Pheretime; but is baffled in an attempt upon Cyrene, and by order of the satrap returns to Egypt leaving the native tribes unmolested.[2]

## Book V.

Megabazus, the lieutenant of Darius, who, on his master's return to Persia after the Scythian expedition, had remained in Europe, completes the reduction of the Thracian tribes, already in part subdued by Darius. A general description is here given of the Thracian people, its origin and national peculiarities. A few notices are subjoined of other barbarous European nations to the north and westward. Megabazus extends his conquests to the Pæonians, and some other kindred tribes.[3] He then sends ambassadors to Macedonia, to demand submission by Earth and water, from Amyntas king of that country. The demand is acceded to; but the Persian envoys are slain, in revenge of the insolent conduct of which, while enjoying the hospitality of the Macedonian court, they had been guilty towards the females of the royal family.[4]

Darius rewards Histiæus tyrant of Miletus, for his fidelity during the late Scythian war, by bestowing on him a principality on the coast of Thrace. Afterwards, becoming jealous of his increasing influence, he invites him to Susa and detains him as a

[1] 145—199. [2] 200—205. [3] 1—16. [4] 17—22.

counsellor and favourite in the imperial court. Histiæus appoints his brother Aristagoras to act as governor of Miletus during his absence. Aristagoras, in the hope of adding the isle of Naxos to his Milesian sovereignty, espouses the cause of certain Naxian refugees, and persuades Artaphernes the Persian satrap of Sardis to join with him in an attempt to subdue that island. The enterprise fails owing to dissensions between the Greek and Persian commanders.[1] In the sequel Aristagoras openly revolts against Darius, secretly abetted by Histiæus. Most of the Greek colonies join the insurrection, and application for aid is made to Sparta. The present state of that republic is described. Cleomenes the reigning king, after a conference with Aristagoras, declines engaging in a war against a sovereign whose capital lay so far distant from the sea coast. A description follows of the imperial line of route from Sardis to Susa.[2]

Aristagoras then applies to Athens, the state of which city, lately delivered from the sway of Hippias son of Pisistratus, is described. Mention is made of the death of Hipparchus, brother and colleague of Hippias, by the hands of Harmodius and Aristogiton. The descent of these patriots from the old Phœnician settlers in Bœotia suggests some notice of Cadmus, and of his introduction of letters into Greece. The family of the Alcmæonidæ, who, when ejected from Athens by Hippias, had fixed their residence at Delphi, bribe the Pythoness to espouse the cause of Attic liberty. She induces the Spartan government to join in an attack on the usurper, who is expelled the city. Athens, now restored to freedom, makes rapid advances in prosperity, though still disturbed by factions, of which, and of those of the neighbouring states of Argos and Sicyon, some account is given. The Spartans and Bœotians, desirous of checking the rising power of Athens, take part with the Athenian malecontents, and invade Attica. The Spartan force, after an empty demonstration, returns home. The Bœotians, defeated by the Athenians, apply for succour to the Æginetes, who accede to their request; having been from a remote period on unfriendly terms with Athens. The traditional causes of this feud are related. The Spartans, in a council of the Dorian states, propose as the best means of subduing the spirit of their Attic rivals, to reestablish the Tyranny of the Pisistratidæ. This scheme is opposed by the Corinthians, who narrate at great length the history of their own sufferings under the rule of their late

[1] 23—34. [2] 35—54.

despots Cypselus and Periander; and refuse to cooperate in any attempt to impose a similar yoke on their fellow Hellenes. Their opposition is successful, and the project falls to the ground.[1]

Hippias, when ejected from Athens, retains possession of Sigeum, an Athenian dependency on the coast of Æolis. Here, encouraged by the Persian satrap of that province, he concerts measures for his restoration to power. The Athenians remonstrate with the satrap on this proceeding, but without effect. About the same time Aristagoras arrives at Athens, and solicits support to the Ionian league against the Persians. The Athenians send twenty ships, which join with the other forces of the league in an attack on Sardis. The town is destroyed, but the citadel holds out, and the allies are forced to retire. The Athenian fleet returns home and the Ionian land army is defeated by the satrap.[2]

Aristagoras succeeds in extending the insurrection against Darius to the isle of Cyprus. Histiæus, about the same time, persuades the king that the revolt of the Greek provinces is owing to his own absence from his Milesian seat of government; whither he is allowed to repair, on the understanding that he is to use his influence in restoring the imperial authority. In Cyprus the combined Ionian and Cyprian forces are beaten, and the island is reduced to subjection.[3] The Carians next join the league, but they too are speedily subdued. Aristagoras, baffled in all his schemes, retires to Myrcinus, the European territory formerly given by Darius to Histiæus, where he and his followers are soon after destroyed by the neighbouring Thracian tribes.[4]

## Book VI.

Histiæus, on reaching Ionia, openly espouses the cause of the insurgents. They assemble a large naval force, but in a battle with the Perso-Phœnician fleet their own is defeated and dispersed. The Persians besiege Miletus; which city, in the sixth year of the war, is taken and destroyed. Its inhabitants are sold as slaves, and the neighbouring region submits to the Persians. The Samian warriors of the shattered Greek fleet, shunning the risk of a similar fate, seek their fortune in Sicily; where by a signal act of treachery they obtain possession of the city of Zancle.[5]

Histiæus, mustering a small force at Byzantium, still prosecutes

[1] 55—93. [2] 93—103. [3] 103—116.
[4] 117—126. [5] 1—25.

the war; but after various disasters is captured and put to death by Harpagus satrap of Ionia; and the Greek colonies are again brought under allegiance to Darius, together with those on the European shore of the Hellespont.[1] The most remarkable of the latter was the principality of Chersonesus, originally founded by Miltiades a noble Athenian. On the failure of his male issue, the succession had devolved on another Miltiades, nephew of the founder, the same who, on the Scythian expedition of Darius, had proposed to his fellow Ionians to destroy the bridge over the Danube; and who now, without attempting terms with Darius, returns and resettles in his native city Athens.[2]

Darius fits out an expedition under the command of Mardonius against that city, in revenge of her late attack on his Lydian capital. The fleet in attempting to double cape Athos is shattered by a storm, and Mardonius returns to Asia.[3] In the sequel the king sends envoys to demand submission by Earth and water from the Greek states; with which demand many, among others the Æginetes comply. The Athenians and Spartans are about to punish them for this betrayal of the national interest, when a difference arises on the the subject between the two Spartan kings, Cleomenes and Demaratus. An account follows of the origin and genealogical succesion of the royal race of Sparta, and of their monarchal office, its privileges and duties. The rivalry between the two sovereigns ends in the deposition of Demaratus by the Ephori, on the alleged ground of illegitimate birth. Irritated by this indignity, he takes refuge at the court of Darius. Cleomenes his late colleague becomes deranged, and after other extravagant acts destroys himself. This catastrophe was supposed by some to be a judgement on him for having, in a late war between Sparta and Argos, burnt alive six thousand warriors of the latter state in the sacred grove of their god Argus. War breaks out between Athens and Ægina.[4]

Darius fits out against Attica a second expedition of 600 ships under Datis and Artaphernes, accompanied by the refugee Athenian tyrant Hippias. They first assault and sack Eretria in the isle of Eubœa, which city had taken part with the Athenians in their attack on Sardis. Then crossing over to the Attic coast, they disembark, and take up a position on the plain of Marathon. The Athenians march out to oppose their advance, and send to Sparta for aid against the common enemy. The Platæans, who

[1] 26—32. [2] 33—41. [3] 42—45. [4] 48—93.

had formerly placed themselves under the protection of Athens against the oppression of the Thebans, join the Athenians with their whole force. A battle ensues, in which the allies, commanded by Miltiades, defeat the Persians, who fly to their ships, reembark, and return home.[1] The Lacedæmonian succours arrive the day after the battle. The historian notices the charge brought against the Alcmæonidæ, of having treacherously cooperated with Hippias on this occasion. The rise of that family is described, with a particular account of the marriage of Megacles son of Alcmæon to the daughter of Clisthenes tyrant of Sicyon.[2]

Miltiades, having persuaded his fellow-citizens to place at his disposal a fleet of seventy ships, invades the friendly isle of Paros, without authority from the Athenian government. The Parians make a gallant resistance, and Miltiades is beaten off, dangerously ill from the effects of a fall, got in attempting to take the place by stratagem. On his return to Athens he is found guilty of treason; but the punishment of death due to his offence is commuted to a fine of fifty talents, in consideration of his services at Marathon, and of his having formerly annexed the isle of Lemnos to the dominions of Athens. Shortly after his trial he dies of his wound.[3] An account is given of the mode in which Lemnos was acquired, with some details of the early history of the Lemnian Pelasgi, formerly resident in Attica, whence they had migrated at an early period to the island still possessed by their descendants.[4]

## Book VII.

Darius, on hearing of his defeat at Marathon, prepares a more powerful armament for the invasion of Greece. While thus engaged, he learns that the Egyptians had revolted, and resolves to superintend in person the measures for their reduction. Before setting out he names Xerxes successor to his throne, in preference to his elder children, as being the first son born to him since he became king; but his designs are frustrated by death. Xerxes follows out his father's military projects: Egypt is speedily reduced, and the ensuing four years are occupied in collecting a vast army for the conquest of Hellas. In order to escape the maritime disasters formerly suffered by Mardonius, he causes a canal to be

[1] 94—120. [2] 121—131. [3] 132—136. [4] 137—140.

cut through the isthmus that connects mount Athos with the continent, and a bridge of boats to be thrown across the Hellespont; the construction of which work is described.[1] The following spring he crosses into Europe, and advances southwards with a host of several millions of men and a fleet of above 4000 vessels. A descriptive catalogue is given of the nations ranged under his banners.[2] Traversing Thrace and Macedonia he crosses mount Olympus into Thessaly; when the Thessalians with the Thebans and other Bœotian states renew their allegiance.[3] The preparations of the more patriotic Greeks for the national defence are described.[4] The Argives decline cooperating, on the ground of inability, since the recent destruction of their best warriors by the Spartans.[5] Envoys are sent to Corcyra, Crete, and the Sicilian republics, soliciting aid; and some account is given of the political state of Sicily. Gelon, prince of Syracuse, offers to contribute a large force, on condition of sharing the command of the common armament with the Spartans and Athenians. The refusal of this condition breaks off the negotiation. In the sequel Gelon himself is engaged in a war with the Carthaginians, whom he defeats on the same day on which the Greeks conquer at Salamis.[6] The Corcyræans agree to send assistance, but afterwards evade the fulfilment of their promise. The Cretans are warned by the Pythoness to abstain from the alliance, on grounds connected with certain events of their early history, of which an account is given.[7]

The Greeks send a force to defend the Thessalian frontier. Convinced, however, by a message from the king of Macedon who secretly befriends them, of the impolicy of this plan, they determine to retire on Thermopylæ, the pass between Thessaly and central Greece, of which a description is given. The Thessalians, who had hitherto been wavering, now cordially espouse the Persian interest.[8]

The Persian fleet, after suffering severely from a storm, advances towards the Greek station at Artemisium.[9]

The Greek land force, in number about 6000, under the command of the Spartan king Leonidas, defends the pass of Thermopylæ during several days against the entire Persian army. Xerxes, through the treachery of a Melian named Epialtes, obtains possession of a mountain track which enables him to surround the

[1] 1—36. [2] 37—100. [3] 101—137.
[4] 138—147. [5] 148—152. [6] 153—167.
[7] 168—171. [8] 172—174. [9] 175—195.

Greeks. Leonidas now abandons all hope of protracting the defence. He therefore sends home the troops under his command, with the exception of his own 300 Spartiates, with whom he resolves to die at his post, of 700 Thespians who also voluntarily remain, and of 400 Thebans, whom he detains from a knowledge of their secret disaffection, in order that they may be forced, however unwillingly, to combat the invaders. The Spartans and Thespians, after a heroic conflict, are destroyed. The surviving force of Thebans supplicates, and obtains, quarter from the enemy.[1]

## Book VIII.

A catalogue is given of the Greek naval armament of 280 ships assembled at Artemisium. Eurybiades of Sparta is appointed commander in chief; the Athenians having, at the desire of the confederacy, ceded their prior claim to that honour. The great body of the Greeks, terrified by the overwhelming force of the Persians, propose retreating southwards and taking refuge in the inner seas and gulfs of Hellas. They are prevented from following out this intention by Themistocles the Athenian commander who, by a stratagem, forces on an engagement. After several days' fighting, to the advantage of the Greeks, the fleets separate without decisive success on either side. The Greek fleet retires on the arrival of the news of the battle of Thermopylæ.[2]

The land army of Xerxes ravages the Phocian territory. A portion of it, in an attack on the Delphic sanctuary, is destroyed by supernatural agency.[3]

The Greek fleet, retiring, takes up a new position off the isle of Salamis. The Athenians, on learning that the land forces of the confederacy, in breach of their engagement to make a stand in Bœotia against the enemy, were limiting their operations to the defence of the Corinthian isthmus, abandon their city, and seek refuge for their families in Salamis, and in the neighbouring isles and maritime states of Peloponnesus. Xerxes occupies Athens, after a gallant resistance by a few of the citizens who had clung to the defences of the Acropolis.[4] The Greek naval commanders, terrified by the advance of the enemy, propose retiring from their new position at Salamis, and taking up one more favourable for the protection of the Isthmus. Themistocles again succeeds in

[1] 196—239. [2] 1—26. [3] 27—39. [4] 40—55.

persuading them to hazard an action, by threatening, should they abandon the coast of Attica, to withdraw the Athenian force altogether and found a new state for his fellow-citizens on the coast of Italy. The fleet of Xerxes advances on Salamis, simultaneously with the march of his land force on the Isthmus. A description is given of the Peloponnesian tribes whose troops were assembled for the defence of that frontier. The Greek naval commanders, hearing that the Isthmus is about to be attacked, once more contemplate a movement in that direction; but are again prevented by a stratagem of Themistocles, and forced to fight. In the battle which ensues the Persian fleet is vanquished and in great part destroyed.[1]

Xerxes resolves on returning to Asia, leaving 300,000 of his best troops with Mardonius, who engages to complete the conquest of Greece in the ensuing season.[2] Themistocles proposes that the confederate fleet should sail to the Hellespont, and destroy the bridge of boats. This counsel is overruled by that of Eurybiades, who urged the danger of leaving on the soil of Hellas a large body of desperate men, who could only preserve life or obtain subsistence by deeds of rapine and violence. Themistocles then scours the Archipelago with the Athenian squadron, exacting fines from the states and islands that had espoused the Persian interest.[3]

Xerxes reaches the Hellespont, with a small remnant of his troops; the greater part, with the exception of those left with Mardonius, having perished by the way from fatigue, famine, or disease. He finds the bridge of boats destroyed by inclement weather, and crosses the strait on shipboard.[4]

Themistocles is judged by the general award of the Hellenes to have deserved best of the common country in the late series of naval actions.[5]

Artabazus who, with 60,000 of the troops of Mardonius, had escorted Xerxes on his march to the Hellespont, besieges and takes Olynthus, but is baffled in an attempt on Potidæa; and retreating with the loss of three fifths of his force, rejoins Mardonius in Thessaly.[6]

The remains of the Persian fleet take up positions at Cuma and Samos, to check attempts at insurrection in the Asiatic Greek

[1] 56—96. [2] 97—107. [3] 108—112.
[4] 113—120. [5] 121—125. [6] 126—129.

colonies. In the ensuing spring the Greek fleet, mustering in full force at Ægina, is invited by the Ionians to aid them in shaking off the Persian yoke; but proceeds, for the present, no further than Delos.[1]

Mardonius sends Alexander king of Macedon to treat for a separate peace with the Athenians. The Argive origin and early history of the Macedonian royal family are narrated. The proposals of Mardonius are rejected by the Athenians.[2]

## Book IX.

Mardonius, advancing southward through Thessaly and Bœotia, occupies Athens. The Spartans, after many delays, send, under the command of Pausanias uncle of king Archelaus, a large force towards the Attic frontier, ready to take the field against the Persians.[3] Mardonius, having destroyed the city of Athens and laid waste Attica, retires upon Bœotia, and distributes his troops along the banks of the Asopus in the neighbourhood of Platæa. The Greek army, advancing in the same direction, takes up a position opposite the Persians on the declivities of Cithæron. In the skirmishes which ensue, the advantage is on the side of the Greeks, chiefly owing to the valour of the Athenians.[4] After many days consumed in manœuvres by the two lines, a general engagement takes place, in which the Persians are routed. Mardonius is slain; his camp and treasure captured; and his army, with the exception of 40,000 men under the command of Artabazus, who had treacherously kept aloof from the battle, is dispersed.[5]

The confederate force invests Thebes, and compels the inhabitants to deliver up the leaders of the Persian party in that city; several of whom are put to death by Pausanias.[6]

On the same day on which the battle of Platæa was fought, another victory was gained at Mycale on the coast of Ionia by the Greek naval force under the Spartan commander Leotychides, who had been invited by the Samians to support them and their fellow-colonists in a general insurrection against the Barbarian power. On the approach of the Greeks the Persian fleet retires from Samos to Mycale, where the land force of Xerxes was encamped. The ships are here drawn up on the land and fortified

[1] 130—132. [2] 133—144. [3] 1—12.
[4] 13—24. [5] 25—85. [6] 86—88.

with stockades. These fortifications are assaulted and carried by the Greeks, the defending force routed, and the Ionian states emancipated from the Persian yoke. The remains of the enemy's troops escape to Sardis, where the court of Xerxes then lay.[1] Some details are given of the illicit amours and other criminal excesses of that monarch and of the members of his family.[2]

The Hellenic fleet sails for the Hellespont, to destroy the bridge of boats. On discovering it to be no longer in existence, Leotychides, with the Spartan ships, returns home. The Athenians remain and invest the city of Sestus, within the walls of which, as their last stronghold in that region, a large body of Persians had collected. The city, after an obstinate resistance, is abandoned by its defenders, and occupied by the Athenians, who return home, carrying with them, among other spoils, the fragments of the bridge of boats as the last trophies of this victorious war.[3]

Research of Herodotus.

2. The critical examination of every historical work involves two fundamental heads of inquiry. The first relates to its value as a work of utility; how far it is to be considered as a complete and authentic narrative of events. The second relates to its value as a work of art; how far the mode in which those events are narrated is judicious and elegant. We shall first direct attention to the former head, both as being in itself the more important of the two, and as involving subordinate questions, the consideration of which may be useful also in their bearings on the subsequent more strictly literary portion of our subject.

How to be critically estimated.

It must further be remarked that, in the case of a work such as that of Herodotus, the merits of the author may, with reference to the first head of inquiry, deserve to be judged by a different standard from that which we are bound to apply to his text. The value of every history, as a work of utility, must

[1] 89—107. [2] 108—113. [3] 113—122.

primarily depend on the copiousness and authenticity of the materials at the author's disposal. He is responsible for diligence in his efforts to discover those materials where they exist, and for judgement and honesty in his treatment of them when found. But where they are wanting he cannot create them. The historian therefore, who undertakes a subject the materials for which are abundant and accessible, while he enjoys a greater advantage, also incurs a greater responsibility than one whose researches are undertaken in a region comparatively barren of such aids to his guidance.

By reference to this rule, the responsibility incurred by Herodotus in regard to the intrinsic value of his history, will be measured, both on account of his limited sources of knowledge and of the elementary state of the critical art in his age, by a less rigorous norm than is generally enforced in the case of a modern historian. But this indulgence towards the author cannot be extended to his work. History, in the better sense in which alone the term is here used, may be defined the narrative of authentically attested facts; and the value of every historical work, as a work of utility, depends on the degree in which that definition is applicable to its contents. The circumstance that in any particular case such authentic testimony was not to be procured, may be an apology for the author who, in default of it, presents his public with an imperfectly verified narrative, especially where he displays candour and ingenuity in the treatment of his defective materials; but it cannot invest such a narrative with the attributes of authentic history. If judged by this rule, the work of Herodotus will be found signally deficient, in com-

parison with many others of far inferior ability, celebrity, or popularity.

Definition of the Greek term Ἱστορίη, History.

The original Greek term History, ἱστορίη, applied by himself to his labours, signifies, in the primitive sense in which he solely or chiefly uses it, "knowledge procured by inquiry or research." In a more advanced stage of technical language, of which there may also be traces in his text, it assumed its now familiar sense of "narrative of facts or events concerning which such knowledge has been procured." The phrase seems to have been first introduced into the vocabulary of the historical art, after that art had reached a certain stage of advancement, in order to express the greater degree of care expected from its professors in collecting and sifting their materials. It also probably implied a distinction between their method and that of the old logographers, whose works were little more than prose paraphrases of the still older poetical repertories of mythical tradition. The frequency of its occurrence in Herodotus, and the emphatic manner in which at times he uses it, show, apart from other evidence, how much he was alive to the importance of the duty of careful research which it enjoined, and how desirous to fulfil that duty to the best of his ability. In order to judge how far he has succeeded, the following points offer themselves for consideration: What was the precise nature of the historical research of Herodotus; in what mode was it conducted; and towards what sources was it directed? On these points the historian nowhere affords any specific explanation; but the indirect notices occurring in his narrative enable us to form a tolerably accurate estimate. For the better guidance of our judgement, it will be desirable here to

take a concise view of the general principles by which the value of all historical research must ultimately be tested.

Different kinds of historical evidence.

As history, in the more critical sense, denotes the record of authenticated events, historical research may be defined as that research alone which aims at the discovery of authentic evidence of events. Events may be authentically attested in two modes; by oral testimony or by written record. The latter kind of evidence is by far the more important of the two, and forms, in periods of advanced civilisation, almost the only species of authority to which, in regard to any other than the affairs of his own time, the critical historian is used to defer. It admits, however, of being classed under several degrees of authenticity. The first or highest degree is that of records prepared by persons contemporaneous with the events recorded. The second is that of records so nearly contemporaneous with the events, as to afford a presumption that the knowledge of the persons by whom they were prepared was derived from other strictly contemporaneous authorities; or in which appeal is made to such authorities, now perhaps no longer extant. Where the events belong to an age long prior to that of the writer, and are not certified by appeals to more authentic sources, the written record of them can be considered of authority merely as representing the oral tradition current at the time when it was embodied.

Oral testimony can rank as strictly authentic evidence only where the person from whom it is derived was concerned in or cognisant of the events which he attests, or where he was at least contemporaneous with them; the events themselves being of sufficient

general notoriety to warrant the belief that an intelligent contemporary would possess a competent knowledge of them. In respect to transactions of remoter date, such testimony loses its value in a degree commensurate with the greater or less remoteness of the date. Where the person affording it speaks, not from contemporaneous knowledge or information, but on reports transmitted from a previous generation, his evidence becomes Tradition; where the supposed epoch of the events is still more remote, tradition degenerates into Legend or Mythology. If the stages through which tradition passes are few, and the organs of its transmission possess reasonable claims to be considered trustworthy, it may be allowed a share, however limited, of historical value; and a like indulgence may even, on valid grounds of speculative historical probability to be further considered in the sequel, be extended in special cases to mythical legend.

In order to estimate the number or worth of the historical data of these various kinds at the disposal of Herodotus, and his mode of turning them to account, it will be proper briefly to consider that portion of the history of the antient world which he has selected for treatment.

Period of history treated by Herodotus.

3. The main subject of Herodotus may be said to commence with the usurpation of the Lydian throne by Gyges in 717 B.C.; and the events to which, either in his principal narrative or his episodes, he assigns historical importance, to be comprised within the epoch of the Dorian occupation of Peloponnesus. This event, which dates in the received chronology some three centuries before the accession of Gyges, has been recognised by the general consent of the critical

public, antient and modern, as forming a boundary line, however faint or ill-defined, between the heroic and the historical age of Greece.

His neglect of the Mythical age.

When we consider the ingenuous fondness with which Herodotus in so many places dwells on the mythical legends of his country, and the evident faith which he reposes in the more prominent among them, as embodying in poetical form the facts of primeval history, we have the better reason to appreciate the good sense which led him to restrict his own immediate subject to comparatively recent portions of his native annals. This exercise of critical caution is also the more creditable to him, from its contrast to the course pursued by many popular authors of his own age and class; who not only allotted a large share of attention to such poetical matters, but often gave them an exclusive preference over the events of later authentic history.

It may however be asked: Why, if Herodotus believed these heroic traditions to record historical facts, has he excluded them from a due share of attention in a work the object of which was to digest into one grand historical mass all that was most interesting in the early annals of his country; many of them being also far more closely identified as historical truths with the sympathies of his public, than other later transactions treated by him in detail? If he believed in a Trojan war or an Argonautic expedition, why should he have assigned to those popular standards of early Hellenic history, a less prominent place in his page than he has allotted to the revolutions of extinct Lydian dynasties, or the migrations of Scythian and Cimmerian barbarians?

To this question it may be answered, in the first

place, that credulous as Herodotus was, even while admitting the events recorded in those heroic legends to be facts, he did not admit them to be so altogether in the same sense as the events which form his principal subject. His mind was here under the influence of two kinds of faith: of a full and positive faith in the one class of events; of a limited or conventional faith in the other. If asked whether he believed in the great national vicissitudes of the ante-Dorian age, he would assuredly have answered, and has in fact in many incidental passages answered, in the affirmative. But he would probably have added, that the poetical mode in which those vicissitudes are recorded, the remoteness of the age in which they took place, and their consequent slender connexion with the subsequent course of events, rendered them inappropriate subjects for treatment in the graver forms of authentic history; especially in a work the design of which was not so much to narrate in consecutive order the annals of Greece, as to concentrate the principal vicissitudes of the civilised world around that grandest of the whole series which forms the catastrophe of his great historical epopee. He might further have added, that such familiarity with those primeval events as was desirable for his readers, was already fully provided for in numerous other popular works in poetry or prose; that he has therefore been contented to treat them but in the way of episode, and as a means of imparting relief or embellishment to his principal subject.

A like method has been pursued in regard to the foreign nations which act the more prominent parts in his narrative. Their remoter mythical annals are, as a general rule, if not overlooked altogether, noticed

but in the same episodical form as the parallel Greek traditions. The affairs of Persia and Media, for example, are traced back so far only as was necessary to a right understanding of the position of those countries towards each other and the neighbouring states, at the epoch when they assume historical importance in his page. A partial exception may perhaps appear to have been made in favour of Egypt. The remote, and for the most part mythical details of the 11,500 years and 360 generations of kings, of which his native Egyptian authorities boasted, are certainly treated with more attention than the parallel legends of other rival nations to the eastward. This may be explained on the simple ground, that a full statistical account of this extraordinary land was evidently an uppermost object of Herodotus in the general plan of his work; and such an account, owing to the peculiar character of the country, its geography, and its monuments, necessarily comprised a more or less copious ingredient of primeval history. The details given relate accordingly, with little exception, to the supposed authors of those stupendous works of art which the historian takes so great pleasure in describing.

His historical sources.

Thus far concerning the portions of history, if such they can be called, to which he has denied a place among his principal heads of subject. It remains to consider somewhat more narrowly the claims to authenticity of those to which that honour has been conceded; or in other words: What is the nature, and what the value, of his historical materials in the proper sense?

Admitting the narrative of Herodotus, from the epoch of the Heraclid invasion downwards, to rest on a substantial basis of fact, it must also be admitted

that the authorities in support of it which he either expressly cites, or to which he appears to have deferred, are, as tried by the standard of modern criticism, of a very unsatisfactory nature. His statements, in so far as appeal is made to testimony of any kind, rest, with rare exception, on that inferior class of testimony which has above been ranked under the general head of oral. His references to written authorities are so few and incidental, as to show both the paucity of those at his command, and how little alive he was to their preferable claims to attention over that hearsay or tradition to which he so constantly appeals. Those which he quotes, or which it was in his power to quote, may be classed under two general heads: first, works of previous historians; secondly, state registers, and other monumental records public or private. We shall first direct attention to those of the former class.

Previous historians.

4. It has been seen, in a previous chapter, that none of the prose writers who preceded Herodotus can claim an antiquity, or by consequence credit as contemporary chroniclers, beyond a few generations prior to his own time. The only one whom he cites by name is his immediate predecessor Hecatæus. Of the two recorded works of this author, one was entirely devoted to mythological subjects. The other was properly a geography not a history; and such historical notices as it contained were limited solely or chiefly to the mythical age. Accordingly, on one of the only two occasions where Herodotus quotes Hecatæus, he does so not in the mode of appeal to his testimony, but in ridicule of his vainglorious attempt to trace back his pedigree to an Egyptian god.[1] On the second occasion

Hecatæus.

[1] II. 143.

he quotes him as at issue with the native Athenian authorities on a point of the early mythical annals of Attica.[1] The other passages of Herodotus, in which speculative commentators[2] would discover plagiarism from, or indirect allusion to the text of his Milesian predecessor, all relate to matters of a strictly geographical nature, and respecting which it is probable that he was himself at least as well qualified to speak from personal observation as any other writer.

Of the other prose authors whose works were, or may have been published before that of Herodotus, the greater number were, like Hecatæus, either geographers or mythologers. Six alone appear to have treated subjects of real history belonging to the period over which the historian's narrative extends: Charon of Lampsacus; Xanthus the Lydian; Hippys of Rhegium; Antiochus of Syracuse; Stesimbrotus of Thasos; and Hellanicus of Lesbos. None of these writers have been named by Herodotus; nor, with the single exception of Hecatæus, does he ever distinctly allude to the testimony of any previous prose author as the foundation of his own statements. His expressions, either in simply referring to authorities, or in discussing, as he constantly does, the varieties of belief which existed as to events recorded by him, apply in their natural sense solely to verbal information, whether procured in answer to his inquiries or in the way of current rumour. It is true indeed that such phrases as "it is said," "it is reported," might at times, according to the idiom of the Greek, as of other languages, admit of being interpreted of what had been said or reported in writing, rather than by word of mouth. In a work, however, where such

[1] VI. 137. [2] Müller ad Hecatæi Frag. 292. sqq. (Didot.)

expressions so constantly occur in a plainly literal sense, we are not at liberty to take them in any particular case in a figurative sense, without some strong internal evidence in favour of the latter; the less in a work where there is an almost total absence of direct citation of written authorities. The cases, if any there be, in which such latitude of interpretation is admissible, are of very rare occurrence.

Xanthus. Among the six writers above mentioned, the one by whose previous labours it might appear most natural for the historian to have profited was Xanthus, whose Lydian history may be presumed to have been published during the youth of Herodotus. As Xanthus was himself a Lydian, and enjoyed the credit of having compiled from native sources, a stranger writing on Lydian subjects was under the greater obligation to consult his text, if not to defer to his authority; and, in regard to Herodotus, we have a general, but somewhat vague statement of Ephorus to that effect.[1] The collation, however, of the Lydian history of Herodotus with the remains of Xanthus, affords no evidence that the former author was so much as acquainted with the labours of his predecessor. In our previous notice of Xanthus, it has been seen that the two historians differed on several important details of their common subject. Yet Herodotus no where alludes, as was his ordinary practice in similar cases, to any varieties of tradition current on the points where the two disagree. Among the more prominent examples of discrepancy is the account of the Lydian hero Tyrrhenus, whom Herodotus describes as migrating to Italy, and colonising a great part of that peninsula; while Xanthus

[1] Ap. Athen. XII. p. 515. D.

makes him the patriarch of a provincial tribe of Lydians in his native country. As it is obviously not probable that Herodotus would willingly have departed from his usual and often declared custom[1], of stating both sides of the question, in a case of marked disagreement between himself and the highest native authority, the inference must be that the work of Xanthus was unknown to him.

Charon of Lampsacus.

5. Of the other predecessors of Herodotus, the one to whom there is the greatest appearance of his having been indebted for a portion of his materials, is Charon of Lampsacus. This highly respectable chronicler had, before Herodotus, treated of the Greek wars of Darius and Xerxes, with which he was in great part contemporaneous; and even the scanty remains of his text evince, that many particulars of that important series of events to which special prominence is given by his successor, had been previously narrated in his page. Such are the dream of Astyages concerning his daughter Mandane, the mother of Cyrus; the conspiracy of Pactyas the Lydian treasurer of that conqueror; the joint assault and sack of Sardis by the Ionians, Athenians, and Eretrians, where the number of ships contributed by the Athenians is identical in each account; and the superstitious aversion of the Persians for white pigeons. So marked a correspondence will appear the less likely to be the result of accident, when it is remembered what a variety of conflicting legends there were, as Herodotus himself tells us, relative to the birth of Cyrus.[2] The Persian superstition on the subject of white pigeons was also little likely to have

[1] See especially III. 9.

[2] I. 95.

been noticed by two authors writing in an independent capacity.[1]

Of the other two works of Charon, one on the annals of his native Lampsacus, the other on the succession of Spartan magistrates, the former was on so limited a subject that it might easily have escaped the notice of even a more zealous indagator of written authorities than Herodotus; and his ignorance of the antient name of Lampsacus, Pityusa, or the City of pines, mentioned and illustrated by Charon, is evidence that he was not familiar with the work.[2] The Chronicle of Spartan chief magistrates seems, however, to be referred to by the historian, in the passage of his sixth book[3] where, speaking of the Lacedæmonian kings, "he abstains from tracing in detail their origin or lineage, as that had been fully done by others." But Charon is the only author prior to Herodotus, who is recorded to have treated of that subject.

The circumstance that Herodotus had profited to the extent here supposed, by the previous labours of Charon, without any acknowledgement of his obligation to his predecessor, can hardly expose him to the charge of literary piracy, to which in a parallel case the modern historian would be liable. It was not the ordinary custom, either of Herodotus or of his contemporaries, to cite by name the authorities for or against their own statements, either in the numerous cases of mere verbal information, or in the more rare instances of written testimony. Such an accumulation of names and references in his

[1] I. 138. See supra, p. 166.
[2] VI. 37.: conf. infra, Ch. vi. § 3. note; and Charon, frg. 6.
[3] § 55.

main text, would have greatly detracted from the ease and elegance of his narrative; and the practice of marginal citation was reserved for the age of printing. He seems, therefore, to have treated his written authorities as he has treated his verbal informants, omitting all mention of names, unless when such precision was calculated to give zest to his narrative. The citation by name for example[1], of Thersander of Orchomenus, as his authority for the conversation between the same Thersander and a Persian warrior on the eve of the battle of Platæa, is essential to the spirit of that well told anecdote. A like motive existed in the interest and curiosity of the case, for his mention[2] of Timnas chief minister of Ariapithes king of Scythia, as his authority for the particulars of the death of Anacharsis, the celebrated Scythian traveller. In the only two instances where the text of a previous prose writer has been cited, that of Hecatæus, the exception may be explained, partly as a tribute to the celebrity of that author, both as a statesman and a man of letters; partly as indicating a lurking spirit of rivalry towards so distinguished a predecessor.

Hippys. Antiochus.

Of the four other historians who may have preceded Herodotus in the treatment of any portion of his subject, Hippys, Antiochus, Stesimbrotus, and Hellanicus, the first two had devoted their attention chiefly to the Italo-Sicilian colonies, concerning which they seem to have been the earliest, and at this early epoch the best-accredited authorities; but the re-

[1] IX. 16.

[2] IV. 76. More or less parallel are the cases of Etearchus king of the Ammonians, II. 52.; of Archias of Samos, III. 55.; of Epizelus, VI. 117.; and of Dicæus, VIII. 65.

mains of their works contain no information embodied in the text of Herodotus. The only historical work ascribed to Stesimbrotus was his Memoirs of Themistocles, Thucydides, and Cimon; and the only portion of it by which Herodotus could have profited, was that relative to the early part of the life of Themistocles. But here we have no means of forming an opinion, as the extant allusions of Stesimbrotus to that statesman are confined to the latter portion of his career. Hellanicus, though classed by the popular authorities as an older man than Herodotus, can hardly be considered as an earlier author. In the most important of his works, that entitled Atthis, which treated subjects in part common to Herodotus, mention occurred, as we have already seen, of an event which happened as late as 406 B.C., two years later than the latest event alluded to by Herodotus. Judging therefore from internal evidence, the only clear evidence on the subject, the Atthis may have been the last-published work of the two. In that case the question might be, whether Hellanicus may not have borrowed from Herodotus, as indeed one antient commentator[1] of slender credit has maintained, rather than Herodotus from Hellanicus. Two other works only of Hellanicus can be distinctly recognised as having treated of historical times, the Persica and the Carneonicæ. Both may possibly have been published at an earlier period than the Atthis, and have been known consequently to Herodotus. But neither their remains nor his text contain evidence that such was the case.

Stesimbrotus.

Hellanicus.

[1] Porphyr. ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev. x. p. 466. Mr. Grote makes Hellanicus the later author of the two, but without specifying his reasons. Hist. of Gr. vol. vi. p. 517.

To the published researches of previous geographers the text of Herodotus contains as little allusion as to those of previous historians. It abounds on the other hand in proof of the pains he took to acquire a personal knowledge of the countries he describes. When disappointed of this object, his next anxiety was to procure information from eye-witnesses; either natives of those countries, or travellers who had enjoyed greater facilities than himself. The only written authority which he distinctly cites on any geographical subject is the Arimaspea of Aristeas[1]; a work both in its form and its substance of a purely poetical character, but giving a description of the author's researches in the extreme north of Europe, which Herodotus believed, and probably with justice, to combine with a copious mass of fable a considerable ingredient of truth. He also mentions[2] the voyage of discovery made by his Dorian fellow-countryman Scylax, on the opposite or Ethiopian extremity of the habitable world; but without allusion to any written narrative of that adventure. There seems, however, no reason to doubt that Scylax left such a narrative; and as several notices of southern Asia and Africa, transmitted by later geographers on the authority of Scylax, are identical in substance with the accounts given by Herodotus of the same region, there is the less reason to doubt his having been acquainted with the original work of that enterprising mariner. He notices[3] in some detail the still more important voyage round the Cape of Good Hope, effected by Phœnician navigators in the service of

Geographers.

[1] IV. 13. [2] IV. 44. [3] IV. 42.

Neco king of Egypt. He further mentions, in general terms, many previous writers of Descriptions of the earth, or constructors of Maps of the world, for the expression may admit of either interpretation; but characterises their labours as defective, and tending to mislead rather than instruct.[1] The geographical work of Hecatæus was assuredly one of those the authority of which Herodotus dismisses in this somewhat flippant manner. Porphyry[2] indeed charges him with having pirated from that author several passages of his description of Egypt, those more especially concerning crocodile-fishing, the hippopotamus, and the phœnix. It is however obviously not probable, that a traveller who had studied with such care and diligence everything Egyptian in Egypt itself, should have condescended servilely to copy from another Greek traveller, for whose authority he entertained no great respect, his notices of these three particular matters; an equal knowledge of which he could have had no difficulty in procuring at the fountain head. In spite of the disparaging terms in which Herodotus alludes to the maps current in his day, there can be little doubt that he had availed himself of them in digesting his own geographical descriptions. The detailed account which he gives[3] of the provincial subdivisions of the Persian empire established by Darius, must have been drawn from original Persian documents, illustrated probably by some species of plan. Aristagoras is introduced, accordingly, by the historian[4], tracing those provinces on a map, in his interview with Cleomenes king of Sparta.

[1] iv. 36. 42.
[2] Ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev. x. p. 466.
[3] iii. 89.
[4] v. 49.

Monumental records.

6. The other class of written authorities available to Herodotus were the monumental records preserved in national repositories and religious sanctuaries, or exposed in the chief places of public resort. The most antient and best-accredited monuments of this kind appear to have been the state registers of the Peloponnesian republics. Such were the genealogies of the kings and magistrates of Sparta, Corinth, and Elis; the Chronicles of the priestesses of Juno Argiva; the records of the Olympic victors preserved in the Pisan sanctuary, and those of the victors in the Carnean games of Sparta.[1] Herodotus nowhere cites or even mentions any of these registers; but we cannot infer from his silence that he had not consulted them, with the evidence before us how little punctilious he was in quoting his authorities; and the formal manner in which, on several occasions[2], he recapitulates the Spartan royal descent from Hercules to Leonidas, implies that he had borrowed it from the fountain head; unless, indeed, he was content with the transcript of Charon. All these registers seem to have been of a genealogical and chronological rather than a historical character. Their notices, that is, were restricted solely or chiefly to the succession of kings, or of office-bearers in the magistratures of the different states, and to the periodical returns of the chief national festivals; nor is there a trace of the archives of any Hellenic state prior to the time of Herodotus having embodied a detailed or continuous chronicle of events.

More numerous and often more detailed, were the

[1] Vol. III. p. 430. sqq. 501.; and the author's Remarks on two Appendices to Grote's History (vol. III.), Longman, 1851, p. 1. sqq.

[2] VII. 204., VIII. 131.

notices supplied by the dedicatory monuments accumulated in the agoræ, cemeteries, and other public places of the principal Greek cities, and especially within the precincts of the great national sanctuaries. Herodotus, though by no means so zealous an investigator of this class of monuments as might have been desired, was not insensible to their value, both as historical data, and as antiquarian curiosities or works of art. Several pages[1] are bestowed on the votive offerings sent by Crœsus to the Greek oracular shrines consulted by him during the latter part of his reign; and it is probable that the inscriptions with which the historian implies those monuments to have been provided, may have afforded him illustrations of the eventful close of the Lydian monarch's career. Mention is also made of donations to the Delphic sanctuary by Alyattes the father, and Gyges the remote ancestor of Crœsus[2]; and of a still earlier date by Midas king of Phrygia.[3] Similar offerings by Amasis king of Egypt, and other remarkable personages native and foreign, to Greek deities, are alluded to from time to time as still extant in their sanctuaries.[4] The longest commentary in which he indulges on any such monument, is that bestowed[5] on the very antient tripods inscribed with Cadmean characters in the temple of Apollo Ismenius at Thebes. Other remarkable works of monumental art noticed by him are: the sculptured group of Arion and his dolphin at Cape Tænarus[6], commemorating, in figurative form, the preservation of that celebrated musician from maritime disaster; the picture of the

[1] I. 50. sqq. 54. 92.
[2] I. 14. 25.
[3] I. 14.
[4] II. 182.: conf. 159.
[5] V. 59.
[6] I. 24.

bridge of Darius[1] over the Bosphorus, dedicated to the Samian Juno by Mandrocles architect of that work, with an inscription recording its execution; the two stēlæ of Darius[2], describing, in both the Greek and Persian tongues, the numbers and composition of the army which he led across that bridge; the quadriga[3] dedicated by the Athenians in their acropolis, commemorating their victory over the Bœotians on the Euripus; the inscribed column in the market-place of Samos, recording the valour displayed by two Samian citizens in a sea-fight against the Perso-Phœnicians[4]; the stelæ erected on the battle-field of Thermopylæ by the Amphictyons[5]; the tripod dedicated by the confederacy at Delphi, on which were engraved the names of the Greek states which fought against the Persians; with other similar monuments in the same sanctuary, separately dedicated by the several states.[6]

Oral testimony.

None of these monuments, whether couched in the form of state registers or of dedicatory inscriptions, however valuable as vouchers for isolated facts, could supply Herodotus with the materials for a connected or continuous narrative. The internal evidence of his text also shows him to have been dependent for the details of any such narrative all but exclusively upon oral testimony. In every part of his work[7] he describes himself as diligently engaged in seeking such testimony, whether from persons who had been themselves concerned in the events, or from such as he considered likely to be well informed regarding them. For this purpose he was in the habit of visiting the

[1] IV. 88. [2] IV. 87. [3] V. 77. [4] VI. 14.
[5] VII. 228. [6] VIII. 82., IX. 81.
[7] I. 20., II. 3. 44. 104., III. 55., IV. 16., &c.

chief metropolitan seats, native and foreign, of traditional knowledge. We shall examine the amount and value of the information procured by him in this way, and his mode of turning it to account, with special reference to the several degrees of unwritten evidence, classed in a former page as Contemporaneous oral testimony, Tradition, and Mythology.

Herodotus assures us, and his text contains proof, that he was in the habit of carefully sifting and comparing the conflicting reports derived from different sources, and of digesting his narrative on a balance of their claims to confidence.[1] His method was thus, in regard to more recent events, closely parallel to that of the modern historian in dealing with contemporaneous written records; the one class of data being, in fact, but a previous reduction to writing of those statements which in the other continued to be circulated by word of mouth. It is certain, indeed, that the best accounts of the European wars of the early part of this century, — the events of our own time which offer the nearest analogy to those narrated in the more authentic parts of the historian's work, — are compiled in great part from communications derived from persons who bore a part in those wars. To take a nearer case of illustration; were an author of the present day to undertake a history of the campaign of Waterloo, or even of the previous series of continental wars, he would still find abundant sources of information in the testimony of the surviving combatants. The case here put, making allowance for difference of times and circumstances, would be virtually that of Herodotus, assuming him

[1] I. 1. sqq. 95. 214., III. 9. 56. 121., IV. 8. 76. sq., V. 44., VI. 84., VII. 150. 214., VIII. 94. alibi.

to have first commenced collecting materials for his account of the Persian war at a date equally removed from that of its close. The chief distinction between his case and that of the modern writer would, in respect to this particular kind of data, be to his advantage. In the present advanced state of historical literature, the existing stock of personal knowledge, in proportion as it is less indispensable, becomes less available. The abundance of written documents being such as to supersede in a great degree the necessity of minute personal inquiries, the author who institutes them lays himself open to the charge of officiousness, and those to whom he applies are the less inclined to indulge his curiosity. Herodotus, on the other hand, in proportion as he wanted the like supplies of written information, would have the stronger claim on the memories of earlier contemporaries. His narrative therefore, in so far as resting on the oral testimony of informants contemporaneous with the events narrated, may safely be considered as authentic in substance, whatever allowance may be made for the inaccuracy of its details, owing to error or prejudice on the part of his authorities, or to the fallibility of his own judgement.

Mythical legend.

7. The case alters when we go back beyond the epoch to which such contemporaneous information can reasonably be supposed to have reached. That epoch cannot, on the most indulgent computation, be extended in the case of Herodotus beyond the last quarter of the sixth century B.C., or about the year 520 B.C.; assuming him to have been born in 484 B.C., to have commenced his researches into that remoter period about the age of twenty-four, or in 460 B.C., and to have had opportunity of consulting persons

whose memories could carry them back fifty or sixty years prior to the last-mentioned date. About the middle of the sixth century contemporaneous oral testimony gave place to tradition; which again, some generations further back, degenerated into mythical legend. From one or other, therefore, of these more or less defective sources, the copious details which Herodotus gives of events prior to 520 B.C. must be understood to be derived. The monumental records of those times supplied but a meagre and fleshless skeleton of names or facts; prose history, in so far as already written at or prior to that date, was exclusively engaged with the fabulous heroic age; epic poetry was equally restricted to the same class of subjects; and the few notices transmitted by the lyric poets, whose sympathies were more nearly identified with their own times, were so desultory, as rarely to be intelligible but when taken in connexion with some fuller account of the transactions to which they referred. The question then occurs: In what mode were those copious narratives of the events of Grecian history from the Dorian irruption downwards, with which we are regaled from time to time by Herodotus, transmitted; and what degree of historical value are we justified in attaching to them? Which question involves another of great importance and equal difficulty: How far the historical inquirer is entitled to assume any basis whatever of fact in unwritten or purely traditional records; and by what principle is he to be guided in any particular case, in his attempts to investigate the nature or extent of that basis?

Rules for appreciating its his-

The principles by which the historical research of this work has been guided in respect to those

questions have been already explained.[1] It will here suffice to offer such a concise summary of them as may facilitate their application to the case more immediately before us. We have without hesitation repudiated the hypercritical doctrine of a modern school of classical antiquaries: that in no case whatever is the reality of any event or person to be admitted, unless it can be authenticated by contemporaneous written evidence. The fallacy of this doctrine is more than sufficiently evinced by the inconsistencies and self-contradictions in which its advocates have been involved in their attempts to enforce it; their own practice being in perpetual and glaring conflict with their theory. It has been shown elsewhere[2], that if this dogmatical rule be valid at all, it must be valid to the extent of a condemnation of nearly the whole primitive annals of Greece down to the first rise of authentic history about the epoch of the Persian war. This condemnation would include not only the Trojan and Theban wars, the exploits of Theseus and Hercules, and other legends where the existence of a basis of fact has, even by the more indulgent class of interpreters, been admitted to be doubtful, but many other events, the reality of which has scarcely ever been questioned, and has even, strange to say, been fully admitted by the leading advocates of this same theory with which such admission is so plainly incompatible. It would set aside the belief in a Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus; in an Æolian or Ionian migration; in the early history of the Lydian monarchy, and of the

torical value.

[1] Vol. I. ch. ii.; and the author's Remarks on two Appendices to vol. III. (3rd ed.) of Grote's History of Greece. Longman, 1851.

[2] See Remarks on two Appendices, &c., as already quoted sup. p. 311.

Græco-Asiatic republics as connected with that monarchy. For it would certainly be difficult to adduce authentic contemporary written evidence respecting any one of those events.

The more rational principle of research here preferred is: that in regard to the remoter ages of any people, where written records fail, where consequently the primary condition of all inquiry is an absence of positive proof, the historical critic is entitled to test the truth or falsehood of national tradition by the standard of Speculative historical probability. The results of such speculative inquiry can never, indeed, possess the same value as those founded on authentic written documents. They can rarely amount to more than a fair presumption of the reality of the events in question, as limited to their general substance, not as extending to their details. Nor can there, consequently, be expected in the minds of different inquirers, any such unity regarding the precise degree of that reality as may frequently exist in respect to events attested by documentary evidence.

The general grounds of such speculative argument in favour of an element of truth in oral tradition, admit of being ranged under the following heads: First, the comparative recency of the age in which the event transmitted is supposed to have taken place, and the proportionally limited number of stages through which the tradition has passed: Secondly, the inherent probability of the event; and, more especially, the existence of any such close connexion in the ratio of cause and effect between it and some other more recent and better-attested event, as might warrant the inference, even apart from the tradition on the subject, that the one was the consequence of

the other: Thirdly, the presumption that, although the event itself may not have enjoyed the benefit of written transmission, the art of writing was, at the period from which the tradition dates, sufficiently prevalent to check, in regard to the more prominent vicissitudes of national history, that license in which the popular organs of tradition in a totally illiterate age are apt to indulge.

Application of those rules to the narrative of Herodotus.

8. The portion of antient history, specified in a previous page as forming the main narrative of Herodotus, commences with the accession of Gyges to the Lydian throne in the latter part of the eighth century B.C.; and the events of earlier date to which, in the form of retrospective narrative, he assigns an equal degree of historical value, such as the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus, the expulsion of the Ionian tribes of that country, and their occupation of extensive territories on the coast of Asia, extend several centuries farther back. It forms no part of our present object to test in detail the truth of these, or other legendary chapters of Grecian history, by reference to the various degrees of speculative evidence above enumerated. The result however of any such analysis would tend, no doubt, to justify the distinction which Herodotus has tacitly drawn, between the historical value of those traditions and that of others recording the more remote vicissitudes of his nation; a distinction recognised by the general concurrence of the modern critical public. It may here suffice to remark that, in our own view of the case, the strongest argument in favour of a broader basis of fact in the events of the Dorian period, is that which has above been classed under the third head: the presumption that, although the

events may not themselves have enjoyed the benefit of written transmission, the art of writing was practised in the age when they are supposed to have happened, to an extent sufficient to counteract the license in which the popular organs of tradition, in the absence of such control, are apt to indulge. The evidence that writing was so practised, has been adduced in another part of this work.[1] That evidence however further tends to show, that any such written check on the license of fable was confined to the substance of the transactions recorded. The written monuments of that period contained, as we have seen, little more than the names of certain lines of kings or magistrates, with an imperfect notation of the years during which they held their office; and here and there perhaps a notice of some remarkable occurrence, and that more frequently of a sacred than a political character; the appearance of some prodigy, the delivery of some oracle, the enactment of some standard law. But such permanent records, even of the bare names of persons in whose times important national vicissitudes took place, would help to perpetuate the connexion between the names and the vicissitudes; and in so far prevent the latter from being either consigned to oblivion, attributed to other

[1] Vol. III. p. 397. sqq. The recent publication of Niebuhr's Lectures on antient history (London, 8vo, 1852) has supplied a new and unexpected addition to the list of eminent scholars bold enough to emancipate themselves from the trammels of Wolfian fallacy on the subject of early Greek writing. The reader is referred to Lecture xx. vol. I.; from which it will here suffice to subjoin the following extracts, pp. 180. 183. "I cannot possibly doubt that the art of writing was known to the Greeks at the time of the Trojan war." "It is not improbable that at Athens there may have been records of the last kings, and of the archons for life. The priestesses of Hera at Argos appear also to have been recorded." This whole lecture is well worth perusal; although the distinguished author carries his faith somewhat further than we are prepared to accompany him.

persons or times, or otherwise fundamentally perverted and misrepresented. Besides such more properly historical registers, the gradually increasing practice of writing for ordinary purposes would supply other collateral means of preserving the memory of transactions not themselves recorded in writing. The more definite allotment and settled possession of property, with the more regular subdivision of the classes of citizens, in themselves and as distinguished from the vassal or slave population, would be provided for by written census; the transfer or transmission of property by written conveyance or testament. Such documents, public or private, form a sort of pivots on which would hinge the memory of contemporaneous persons and events; and the parallel increase of sepulchral or dedicatory monuments, commemorating the actions or destinies of individuals or of communities, would tend more directly to the same effect. Abundant scope, however, would still remain for the play of mythological fancy. The particulars of events being still dependent for transmission on the popular voice, would be subject to the usual caprice of popular fiction; to the substitution of supernatural agency for human action; to the license of figurative imagery and poetical embellishment; to exaggeration by the organs of a successful party; to suppression by their opponents. Such influences, operating through a series of generations, might suffice to invest the original nucleus of written fact with almost as dense a crust of mythology as envelopes the legend of the Golden fleece or the Trojan war. Let us assume, for example, the names of Procles and Eurysthenes to have been recorded during their own lifetime, as the first Heraclid sovereigns of Lace-

dæmon. That record, without any detailed account of their actions, would probably have sufficed to impart durable substance to the tradition that the Dorians of Sparta were foreign conquerors, not the indigenous race of the peninsula. But it would not suffice to preserve that tradition from the extravagance of mythical detail which it actually presents, not in the text of Herodotus, for he dwells but little either on the main event or its accessories, but in that of other compilers, who drew doubtless from the same sources to which he must have resorted had he thought fit to enlarge on the subject.[1]

The question as to the mode in which, or the agents by whom, other legends of the post-Dorian period more specially treated by Herodotus, may have been handed down in that copiousness of circumstantial detail which they present in his page, is one to which no satisfactory answer suggests itself. We have seen above that they were denied the benefit, not only of detailed written record, but of that metrical aid to oral transmission enjoyed by the fables of the heroic age. What was here the substitute for this expedient, usually considered indispensable in an illiterate state of society for the preservation of such legendary stories? Were there in the Greek cities fraternities of popular story-tellers, such as we read of among certain eastern nations, who went about reciting the later national vicissitudes in fa-

[1] See Apollodorus and Pausanias, ap. Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. II. ch. xviii. p. 1. sqq.; who in the face of his own twofold doctrine, that all such legendary lore is worthless without written documents, and that no such documents existed in Greece prior to 776 B. C., yet recognises (p. 7. alibi) a substantial basis of fact in the series of Sparto-Dorian traditions from the Heraclid invasion in the eleventh century B. C. downwards. See the author's Remarks on two Appendices, &c., sup. cit.

miliar prose, as did the Homeric minstrels the mythical glories of older times in hexameter verse? Or were there in the principal states professional "loghioi," or depositaries of antient lore, such as Herodotus describes in Egypt, whose duty it was to instruct the citizens in those details of national history which the state annalists disdained to record? No trace exists of any such classes of men in Greece. Yet it is difficult to conceive how, in the mere form of colloquial communication between ancestor and descendant, the memorials of the remote past could have been maintained in that varied richness of fact or fiction which they display in so many parts of the historian's text.[1]

Mythological mechanism of early prose history.

9. The mythological mechanism which the compilers of these narratives, whoever they were, have employed to impart spirit to their tale, is somewhat different from that with which we are familiar in the minstrelsy of the earlier period. The direct intervention of the gods is now rare. Its want, however, is amply supplied by an increase of the secondary order of divine agency, consisting of oracles, dreams, omens, and prodigies; which are accumulated often to such a degree in the text of Herodotus, as to destroy the freedom of human action as effectually as the personal interference of the gods in the Iliad. This indirect kind of supernatural intervention is not, indeed, confined to the more properly mythical portions of the historian's narrative, but is common even to those

[1] Such are his long and complicated accounts (B. IV.) of the successive settlements of Spartan colonies in Thera and different parts of Libya; and the little less precise but better-digested narrative by the Corinthian orator in V. 92., of the political vicissitudes of his country under the Bacchiadæ and Cypselidæ, with the historian's own supplementary notices of Periander and his family.

which rest on contemporaneous authority. As a general rule, however, it is more actively displayed in the conduct of events of remoter date.

We can select no better illustration of these remarks than the life of Crœsus, which forms the opening chapter of the historian's work.

Life of Crœsus.

This monarch, in all the more important vicissitudes of his life, is as complete a tool in the hands of destiny as any hero of Homer or the tragic drama. The declining stages of his career, more especially, hinge on a train of oracular announcements of impending fatality, in the form chiefly of prophetic warnings, which, ambiguous or even deceitful in their terms, and by consequence misunderstood or misapplied, are but so many seductive instigations to the follies or faults against which his insidious Mentors profess to caution him. It had been foretold by an antient but neglected oracle that he was to be the last of his line, and that the sceptre was to be violently wrested from his hand. He is warned in a dream that Atys, the favourite son of the two he possessed, the other being deaf and dumb, was to be slain by a cold steel weapon. To avert this fatality, he debars the youth from martial exercises; but is induced by his entreaties to permit him, under the guardianship of a confidential friend, to take part in a boar hunt; where, by an accidental shot of that friend's javelin, he is slain. The afflicted father consults the Delphic oracle concerning his remaining son's delivery from his infirmity, and is informed that the prince will be endowed with the faculty of speech on a day of great calamity. On the spread of the arms of Cyrus, he has recourse to the more accredited oracles of the age, testing their claims to infallibility

by proposing to each a miraculous feat, which the Pythoness alone performs to his full satisfaction. She thus secures his boundless confidence in her god, and rich donations to her shrine. In the fulness of his faith, he consults her as to his prospects of success in an attack on his formidable rival, and the presumptuous self-confidence inspired by her delusive answer costs him his kingdom. To his further inquiries as to the duration of his power the oracle replies, that "he need be under no alarm until a mule shall sit on the throne of the Medes;" the absurdity of which alternative confirms him in his fatal security. After his first defeat by Cyrus, another omen of his impending fate is vouchsafed. The suburbs of his city suddenly swarm with snakes, which are devoured by herds of horses hurrying from the neighbouring pastures to partake of the filthy repast. Scarcely have his soothsayers time to expound the prodigy, when his empire is overthrown. His capital Sardis, which he attempts to defend, is taken, owing to an oversight of a former king Meles. The concubine of this king had by him become mother of a lion-whelp, which he was instructed by his augurs would, if carried round his city walls, render them impregnable. He caused his monstrous offspring to be carried round every part of the rampart but one corner supposed to be already inexpugnable by nature; and at that corner the Persians now effect their entrance. On the point of being slain by a Persian soldier, Crœsus is preserved by an exclamation of the previously dumb prince, now suddenly endowed with speech, as had been foretold. When enveloped in the flames of the pile to which he is condemned by Cyrus, he prays to Apollo for deliverance, and is pre-

served by a sudden shower of rain sent by the god to extinguish the fire.

Death of Atys.

The interesting and beautifully told tale of the death of Atys has, in itself, apart from the dreams, prodigies, &c., on which it hinges, all the appearance of being made up of purely poetical elements. The calamity is announced as a judgement on Crœsus for the vainglorious presumption displayed by him in his (itself, as we have seen, fabulous) interview with Solon. The whole adventure proceeds, accordingly, under the immediate guidance of the goddess Nemesis. The name Atys, whatever its genuine import in the Lydian tongue, becomes in the Herodotean legend palpably significant of its owner's fate: "the youth under the influence of Atë," the demon of judicial blindness; and under that influence he is made to court the destruction to which he is doomed. The name and character of Adrastus[1], the constituted guardian and involuntary destroyer of Atys, are equally significant of his part in the fatal drama. Adrastus is the name of the hero who, in the Greek mythology, acts as the type or eponymus of Nemesiac destiny. It was as a refugee from the terrors of his own Nemesis, which pursued him on account of a recent fratricide, that this Phrygian Adrastus sought an asylum at the court of Crœsus, where he becomes the involuntary agent of the designs of the same evil genius on his benefactor. His Phrygian pedigree, which represents him as "son of Midas, son of Gordias," does not tend to add historical reality to his character. Even the

[1] "The Doomed;" from α privat. and διδράσκω fugio: "One who cannot escape or fly from his destined calamities." Adrastea, "The Inevitable," is hence, in the same Greek mythology, a title of the goddess Nemesis.

less allegorical part of the story,—the appearance in a distant province of a wild boar, so fierce and formidable as to require for his destruction an army of huntsmen from the metropolis under the command of the crown-prince, — sounds more like a prose paraphrase of some Nestorian episode of the Iliad than an event of real history.

Crœsus on the pile.

The authenticity of some of the other more striking details of the historian's Lydian narrative are open to question, partly on internal grounds, partly because a different account is given of the same transaction by the rival annalist Ctesias, who professed to give the Persian version of them. In a question as to the general claims of the two authors to credibility, Herodotus might be entitled to a preference; and several of the variations of Ctesias are as little probable as the statements of his predecessor. But on some points he has the advantage; especially in omitting, as does also Xenophon[1], the story of the condemnation of Crœsus to the stake, of the repentance of Cyrus, and the delivery of the captive monarch from the flames. It seems in itself far from probable that a Persian fire-worshipper would have degraded his deity to the office of public executioner; and this objection is confirmed by Herodotus himself in another part of his work. Among the outrageous acts committed by Cambyses in Egypt, he caused the body of the late king Amasis to be disentombed and burnt. Upon which the historian remarks[2]: that to consume human bodies by fire was contrary to the law of the Persians, who worshipped fire as a god. Cyrus, the type and essence of genuine Persian patriotism, would

[1] Cyrop. VII. ii. 9. [2] III. 16.

assuredly never have been guilty of such an act of sacrilege.

This chapter, therefore, of the historian's work, if stripped of its apocryphal details, presents, of historical substance, at the most but the following three or four principal facts; that the last Lydian monarch was called Crœsus, that he was in the habit of consulting Greek oracles, and that his kingdom was conquered by Cyrus. It hence illustrates in a very pointed manner the remark formerly made, that when we ascend beyond the period of which Herodotus can be supposed to speak from contemporaneous data, his historical materials, in the proper sense, resolve themselves into little more than the existence of certain remarkable personages, under certain names, as the leading actors in certain remarkable events; but the particulars of their lives, characters, personal relations or performances, remain shrouded under that mythical disguise in which a few generations of popular transmission sufficed to envelope them.

Battle of Thyrea.

We subjoin one more example borrowed from the affairs of European Greece, the account of the battle of Thyrea between the Spartans and Argives.[1] That these two states should have agreed to decide an important national dispute by a combat between 300 chosen warriors on each side is certainly a possible circumstance. But the sequel of the story, which constitutes its main point and spirit, is both impossible and absurd. When the battle was interrupted by nightfall, the whole 600 combatants, we are told, were slain, except three,—two on the side of the Argives, one on that of the Spartans,—who

[1] I. 82.

survived under such circumstances as to deprive either party of positive claim to the victory, and leave the quarrel to be decided in the ordinary forms of warfare. It is hardly necessary to point out how impossible it is, that of 597 men placed, to use an expressive foreign phrase, "hors de combat," in a single day's action, there should not have been a very large portion but temporarily disabled by wounds or by fatigue; many of whom consequently would have recovered, and either have effected their return home, or, if animated by the same ferocious spirit, might have renewed the combat on the ensuing day. Nothing, however, can be more positive than the historian's assurance that the whole 597 actually died on the ground. He is even at pains to inform us that the surviving Spartan, although his countrymen claimed the victory on the strength of his successful championship, was so ashamed of not having shared the glorious death of his 299 comrades, that he slew himself on the field of battle. The portion of the narrative which forms its cream and spirit being thus evidently false, it is the less easy to judge what part of the remainder may be true. There seems however no reason to doubt the primary fact, that in a war between the Spartans and the Argives in support of their respective claims to the disputed frontier district of Thyrea, a drawn battle was fought between nearly equal armies of the two republics.

Foreign history of Herodotus, and its sources.

10. The obstacles which the state of society in the age of Herodotus interposed, even in his native Hellas, to the investigation of truth, beyond the limits of what has here been defined as contemporaneous oral testimony, were still more serious and

the results still less satisfactory, where the same investigations extended to the affairs of distant foreign countries. And here another difficulty presented itself in a characteristic defect, not so much of the historical research of Herodotus as of the literary culture of his age, the prevailing indifference of the Greeks to the study of foreign languages. This is a peculiarity of the classical Greek literature, as compared with that of modern Europe, to which, and to its causes, attention has been devoted in our previous pages. Admitting the full force of the apology supplied, in the special case of Herodotus, by the elementary state of intellectual culture at large in his time, it yet remains difficult to understand how, in the particular line of literary pursuit to which he had devoted himself, one so zealous and otherwise indefatigable in his researches, should not have been alive to the extraordinary benefit to be derived in the prosecution of his great design from a competent knowledge of the tongues of the two great foreign nations, the Persians and Egyptians, who figure most prominently on his scene of action; and to the decided advantage it would have afforded him over rival labourers in the same field. The accessibility in his day of both Asia and Egypt to foreign visitors offered ample facilities for study. Since the settlement of the Greek military colonies in Egypt two centuries before his time, that country abounded, as he himself tells us, in natives versed in the Greek tongue; and it may be safely assumed that an equal number of the Greek colonists were familiar with the Egyptian dialect. The courts of the Persian emperor and his satraps also contained many Greek adventurers, who from motives of interest or necessity had ac-

quired a competent stock of the linguistic attainments to which men of letters at home attached so little value. Be this as it may, it is certain that the genius of Herodotus was here neither above nor beyond that of his age, and that he was contented to borrow his notices of foreign affairs at second hand from persons qualified to impart them in his native tongue.

Of the foreign nations to whose history Herodotus devotes any large share of attention, the most remarkable are the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians, who successively held the empire of central Asia, and the Egyptians. There can be no reasonable doubt that both the Assyrians and the Egyptians possessed written records of contemporaneous events, of an earlier date and more copious nature than those preserved in any part of Greece. It may, however, be questioned whether those imperial chronicles, in their greater richness of detail, were of a more trustworthy character than the more meagre notations of the Greek republics. Much of the amplification that might otherwise have formed the advantage of the Asiatic records, consisted of hyperbolical, and probably in great part fabulous, eulogies of the virtues and exploits of the vainglorious despots who ruled those countries, and who, in furtherance of the same object of personal glorification, were in the habit of expunging or corrupting the annals of their predecessors. The question however, as to the intrinsic value of these documents, is one which comparatively little concerns our present inquiry; the inability of Herodotus to read or understand them rendering him as dependent, as if they had never existed, on the popular organs of tradition; a tradition which, while

founded doubtless to some extent on written memorials, appears in much of its detail as fabulous as the mythology of the heroic age of Greece.

Assyrian history.

Herodotus dwells but slightly on the remoter annals of central Asia, for the reason assigned by himself[1], that he contemplated a separate work or chapter on Assyrian history, which does not seem ever to have been composed. The Assyrian traditions, as narrated in greater detail by other Greek historians, form themselves into three more prominent groups, concentrated around the biographies of as many principal personages, Ninus, Semiramis, and Sardanapalus; upon whom all or most of what was good or evil in the race of native heroes and heroines appears to have been accumulated. Ninus, the founder of the empire and of its capital Nineveh, acts much the same part as Menes in Egyptian legend, or Hellen in that of Greece. Semiramis, the mighty queen and conqueress of the eastern world, finds her counterpart in the Sesostris of Egypt. The history of Sardanapalus, the indolent voluptuary whose empire is wrested from him by the most valiant of his vassal chiefs, is an evident type of the decline of his race and nation. The remainder of the numerous series of Assyrian kings were so little remarkable for qualities or actions of any kind, that their Greek historians consider even their names to be not worth recording. An exception was made by some writers in favour of Memnon; a hero borrowed from Homer, whose Memnon, son of Aurora, was very naturally converted by Græco-oriental fabulists into an eastern prince, sent by the mighty monarch of Asia

[1] I. 184.: conf. 106.

to support his vassal Priam in his last extremity. Such are the main features of Assyrian history as embodied by the popular Greek classics, Ctesias, Diodorus, and others, who have treated it in detail.[1] In the few notices on the subject vouchsafed by Herodotus, he differs in several points from those authorities. The duration of the Assyrian monarchy is limited by him to 520 years[2], commencing in 1230, and ending in 710 B.C. His rival and opponent Ctesias, who advanced special pretensions to draw from native sources, rated it at 1306 years, commencing in 2182, and ending in 876 B.C. Berosus the native Babylonian compiler numbered some 36,000 years as the duration of the entire Assyro-Chaldean

[1] Ap. Clint. Fast. Hellen. I. p. 263. sqq.

[2] I. 95. These 520 years evidently correspond to the 526 years assigned by Berosus the native Babylonian annalist to the forty-five Assyrian kings, who occupy nearly the same chronological position in his system. Nor can we have better proof of the vagueness and imperfection of the data at the historian's disposal, than the wide discrepancy by which this incidental correspondence between the two authors is counterbalanced. With Herodotus these 520 years form the whole duration of the Assyrian empire. With Berosus they form but a single dynasty among the many which he enumerates. With Berosus, Semiramis is the first queen of this dynasty; with Herodotus, she flourishes 500 years later, about the close of the entire empire. With Herodotus, both dynasty and empire are overthrown by a revolt of the Medes; in Berosus, no such revolt is alluded to. The latter compiler, on the other hand, has in his Assyro-Babylonian empire a dynasty of eight Median kings, reigning 234 years, and commencing nearly 1000 years before the Assyrian monarchy of Herodotus, after the break up of which the Medes of Herodotus first appear on the stage. That the 520 years of Herodotus comprehended, in his system, the whole duration of the empire which in the system of Berosus lasted several myriads of years, is evident from the circumstance that with Herodotus the founder of the empire is Ninus son of Belus; which two personages figure, in every variety of the tradition, as the chief god and patriarch of the Assyrian race; although Herodotus most absurdly makes them both descendants of the Greek Hercules. Conf. Beros. Fragg., Didot, vol. II. p. 509.

empire which corresponds to the Assyrian empire of the Greek writers.[1]

We may form some notion of the authenticity of the data on which the more extended but unpublished oriental researches of Herodotus were based, from an incidental passage of his Lydian history[2], where he informs us that Ninus, the founder of the Assyrian monarchy, was a great-grandson of the Greek hero Hercules, and father of Agron, founder of the Heraclid dynasty of Lydia. He enters somewhat more in detail on the circumstances attending the break up of the empire of Ninus. He describes it[3] as falling to pieces in its 521st year, by a general revolt of the vassal provinces against the supreme government. The antient metropolitan districts, of Assyria proper with its capital Nineveh, and of Chaldea with its capital Babylon, continued however, each for a time, to maintain a separate independence[4]; the latter, it would appear from the somewhat ambiguous terms of the historian's text, under a remnant of the old imperial family. The Medes of the upper Euphrates now became, under an independent dynasty of native sovereigns, founded by a popular chief named Deïoces, the dominant power of central Asia.[5] Nineveh was conquered by Cyaxares grandson of Deïoces.[6] Babylon continued to hold out until reduced by Cyrus, great-grandson of Cyaxares, and founder of a new Medo-Persian dynasty.[7] Labynetus, the reigning sovereign of Babylon at the epoch of its conquest by Cyrus, was son of a patriotic queen called Nitocris, and sixth

[1] Clint. loc. citt. The dates of Ctesias have been preferred, with occasional slight variations, by almost all the subsequent native Greek chronologers.

[2] i. 7. [3] i. 95. [4] i. 184. sq.

[5] i. 106. [6] i. 190. [7] i. 188.

in lineal descent from Semiramis. According to this account Semiramis, instead of being, as represented by her popular biographers, the mighty conqueress and extender of the old Assyrian empire, would be either the sovereign under whom that empire was subverted, the Sardanapalus in fact of Ctesias; or would be but a petty Asiatic queen, reigning over the Babylonian remnant which Herodotus describes as surviving for a while the general wreck.[1] Sennacherib[2], the celebrated Scripture king of Assyria, is described by Herodotus as flourishing and carrying on his extensive wars nearly about the time of the disruption; whether before or after it does not distinctly appear. Sardanapalus[3] is also incidentally mentioned by name as a very wealthy king of Nineveh; but here again we are not informed whether of Nineveh before or Nineveh after the disruption, or what may have been his character or ultimate fate. As little knowledge does the historian afford us of the name or character of the hero who, in his tradition, acted the part of universal conqueror assigned by his fellow Greek annalists to Semiramis; for assuredly such a conqueror, in the general spirit of Græco-oriental history, could not have been wanting.

Median history.

11. In the chronology of the Median empire which succeeded, we have another great discrepancy between the leading classical authorities.[4] Herodotus has here 150 years and four reigns, commencing about 709 B.C. and ending 559 B.C. Ctesias has 317 years

[1] Cyrus the conqueror of Labynetus was fifth in descent from Deïoces (I. 102. sqq.), in whose time, or immediately before, the disruption of the old empire took place; Semiramis therefore, the ancestress of Labynetus in the sixth degree, must have been contemporaneous either with Deïoces or with his father.

[2] II. 141. [3] II. 150. [4] Clinton, Fast. Hell. I. pp. 258. 261.

and nine reigns commencing in 876 B.C. The numbers of Herodotus, as tested by collateral data, seem here preferable. Admitting however his framework of fact to be correct, nothing can be more palpably fabulous than the anecdotical details with which it is filled up and embellished. The whole story of Deïoces[1], founder of the new dynasty, is a pure political romance, composed in illustration of the speculative theories of the age relative to the origin of regular government. On the dissolution of the Assyrian empire, its Median province, deprived of the benefits of central administration, is represented as still further broken up into its primary social elements of separate households; without law, police, or courts of justice. Each village elder therefore, or father of a family, performs within his own immediate sphere the functions of magistrate; but in so defective a manner that the consequence is universal discontent. One alone among these patriarchal judges, by name Deïoces, possessed the rare faculty of so adjusting his decrees as to give unvarying satisfaction to all litigants. The result was a flocking of such crowds to his tribunal, that he found it necessary to shut his door against their importunities; alleging that he could not allow his own private affairs to go to ruin by gratuitous attendance on the affairs of his neighbours. The disorder now became greater than ever; until at length they were reduced to the necessity of appointing Deïoces king, of supplying him with a body guard, and building him first a palace and then a fortified city, called Agbatana, where he exercised an equitable but unlimited sway. Cyaxares, the grandson of Deïoces is described, in the same conventional spirit of

[1] I. 95. sqq.

political fable, as doing for the military organisation of the state what his predecessor had done for its civil government, by dividing the national forces, which hitherto all fought in one promiscuous body, into separate corps of infantry, cavalry, and archers.

The only historical fact which could at the best be assumed to lie at the root of this luxuriant growth of didactic fable might seem to be, that the Medes, on shaking off the yoke of the Assyrian emperor, had found it necessary to appoint a king of their own. Ctesias however, the rival authority, gives a different version of the whole story, and certainly the more probable version of the two. According to him Arbaces, a Median officer of high rank in the service of Sardanapalus, revolts against his effeminate lord, deposes him, and reigns in his stead. The same author describes Agbatana, the newly founded city of Deïoces in the legend of Herodotus, as the antient metropolis of Media, which the new native sovereign naturally selected as his place of residence.[1]

While the circumstances which mark the close of the Median dynasty in the page of Herodotus are, as will be seen, no less palpably mythical than those which signalised its commencement, the intermediate transactions, consisting chiefly in the subjugation of provinces of the old empire by the new monarchs, have a greater semblance of historical truth. This is the mode in which the political mythology of Herodotus is usually worked up, and is indeed the ordinary course of mythical invention; the beginning and end of any important series of events being the epochs which commonly supply the materials most favour-

[1] Ctes. Frag. Didot, p. 35. sqq.

able for poetical embellishment. The legends of the dream of Astyages, the last Median monarch; of his consequent bestowal of his daughter in marriage on Cambyses the Persian; of the exposure of her son Cyrus, by order of his grandfather; of his providential preservation, and his dethronement of Astyages on reaching man's estate, while narrated by Herodotus[1] with all the gravity of authentic history, enjoy about as much and deserved credit with the critical public of the present day, as the Roman fables concerning Romulus and Remus, of which they are the evident prototypes.[2] Herodotus himself informs us that he knew in all, including the one he has given, four traditions as current among the Persians concerning the birth of Cyrus and the establishment of the Persian dynasty; and that he has preferred

[1] I. 107. sqq.

[2] The analogy between the two stories extends even to such particulars as the name or nickname of the herdsman's wife, by whom in each case the royal infant is preserved; which is Spaco the "She-dog," in the Græco-Persian original, and Lupa the "She-wolf," in the Latin copy. (Liv. II. 4.) The correspondence between Herodotus and Livy in many other fabulous or anecdotical details of their respective narratives, strikingly evinces the special influence which the work of the former exercised on the legendary lore of the early Latin logographers. The story of Tarquin and the poppy heads is identical in substance with that of Periander and his corn stalks. The devotion of the 300 Fabii is but a paraphrase of that of the 300 Spartans at Thermopylæ. The combat of the three Horatii and three Curiatii finds its parallel in that between the 300 Spartans and 300 Argives at Thyrea. The Greek origin of the story of Tarquin and the Sibyl also betrays itself by a comparison with the two similar cases of Melampus and Tisamenus in Herodotus, IX. 33, 34.

The contempt for historical credibility in the working up of the hyperbolical element of these anecdotes, also displays itself in curiously parallel forms in the two authors. The wild impossibility involved in the account of the mutual massacre of the 300 Argives and Spartans at Thyrea has already been noticed. It is however equalled or surpassed by the statement of Livy, that the 300 patriots who fell on the banks of the Cremera left behind them but a single male relative, a youth of tender years, to maintain and propagate the whole subsequent race of Fabii. Liv. II. 49.

that which he had received from informants who appeared to him more studious of truth than of flattery to the family of Cyrus.[1] It has been well observed by modern commentators, that this version has much the appearance of being the Median account of the matter, and worked up in the mode best calculated to save the national honour of the Medes: Cyrus being here made as much a Mede as a Persian; a legitimate descendant of the Median kings, and in fact the rightful heir of the throne. The Persian account was probably that transmitted by Ctesias[2], who here, as in most other controvertible points, is at issue with Herodotus. According to Ctesias, there was no blood relationship between Astyages and Cyrus; the latter was a native Persian chief, who headed his countrymen in a successful attempt to shake off the yoke of the Medes, as the Medes had, a few generations before, shaken off that of the Assyrians; and Cyrus was the husband not the son of the daughter of Astyages, having married the princess after the dethronement of her father. Here again the only substantial fact that can be elicited from this conflict of fabulous tales, is, that the empire of central Asia, first overthrown and then reconsolidated by the Medes, was wrested from them in their turn, and transferred to the Persians by a Persian chief called Cyrus, the first and greatest sovereign of the Persian dynasty of historical times. The accounts of this monarch's death[3] were as numerous and conflicting as those concerning his birth.

[1] I. 95.

[2] Ap. Phot. Bib. cod. LXXII.; Didot, Frag. Ctes. 29. § 1.

[3] Xenophon, Cyrop. VIII. vii.; Ctesias, Frag. 29. § 6.; Herodot. I. 214., conf. Mitford, Hist. of Gr. vol. II. p. 22. ed. 1822.

Egyptian history.

12. But the portion of the historian's work devoted to Egypt is that which places the nature and value of his foreign research in the clearest light, owing to the more accurate knowledge which we possess of the data by which he was guided. The discoveries of the last half century, while they have demonstrated the written registers of Egypt to contain contemporaneous notices of national history extending back to a very remote epoch, have also convincingly proved that the historical facts embodied in those registers were, as interpreted by native authorities to the Greeks, subjected to the same falsifications and perversions as in the parallel case of the oriental archives. In the original Egyptian documents we find recorded, with more or less appearance of authenticity, the names of several scores of kings, whose reigns extend probably over a period of not less than from 2000 to 3000 years prior to the Christian era; and these royal names are frequently accompanied with sculptured representations, indicating their proprietors to have been mighty warriors and conquerors. In the tradition received by Herodotus[1] from the local interpreters we find, that while the numbers of those years and reigns are multiplied to an extravagant degree, the names and exploits of the kings are concentrated, much as in the case of Ninus, Semiramis, and Sardanapalus, on a comparatively small number of peculiarly prominent and in part to all appearance fictitious personages. The remainder, also as in the case of Assyria, are dismissed[2] as royal drones, or "rois fainéants," who neither attempted nor performed any act worth recording. The entire series of Herodotean sovereigns of Egypt, from the

[1] II. 99. sqq. [2] II. 101.

foundation of the first human dynasty to the Persian conquest, amounts to 360; a conventional number, probably adjusted to that of the primitive solar year. These 360 reigns occupy, according to the historian's no less conventional reckoning by generations, a period of from eleven to twelve thousand years.[1] We have a Menes, as we had a Ninus, founder of the empire. We have a Sesostris, as we had a Semiramis, conqueror of the civilised world. We have an illustrious Egyptian as we had an illustrious Assyrian female called Nitocris. We have no Sardanapalus; the fall of the Egyptian empire being an event too recent and notorious to admit of its being worked up in so purely mythical a form. The other ten or twelve kings specified by name as belonging to the earlier portion of the series, are mentioned, either incidentally in connexion with remarkable works, pyramids, temples, canals, constructed by them, or are themselves the heroes of marvellous and for the most part absurd or trivial anecdotes.

Certain of these Herodotean names can be recognised among those of the Egyptian monuments; where however they appear with accompaniments, and in a chronological order, entirely different from what they offer in the summary of the Greek historian. The "Sesostris" of the latter, whose splendid career forms the culminating point of the whole Herodotean series, whatever element of fact his genuine Egyptian biography may contain, is in the version of the historian an essentially fabulous personage, the mythical type or genius of Egyptian heroic enterprise. No ingenuity of modern criticism

[1] II. 142.

has yet succeeded in identifying this name with the person or performances of any single king. The exploits of its owner appear to be a concentrated exaggeration of those actually performed by a number of warlike monarchs belonging chiefly to the eighteenth or Ramesseïd dynasty; just as the whole mass of Assyrian martial achievement has been concentrated, in the parallel Assyrian legend, upon Semiramis. But the genius of Sesostris is equally paramount in the more important branches of internal economy. He not only conquers all the foreign countries, but he digs all the Egyptian canals, divides the land among the people, apportions the land-tax, and is thus, in the estimation at least of Herodotus, the inventor of geometry, and by consequence of all more advanced science both to Egyptians and Greeks.[1]

The fabulousness of the cycle of 360 kings in the tradition vouchsafed by the priests to Herodotus, is well maintained by the physical impossibility of the details of its arrangement. The period occupied by the first 341 comprised, we are told[2], an exactly equal number of priests of Vulcan; the last king of the royal series and the last priest of the sacerdotal series being moreover the same person; and each series of 341 tallying with an exactly equal number of generations of men. Herodotus does not distinctly assert that the kings succeeded each other in a regular line of generation from father to son; but he does make this assertion relative to the 341 priests. This is also no doubt the natural construction of his statement relative to the kings; the thing stated being in each case obviously incredible and absurd.

[1] II. 108. sq.

[2] II. 142. sq.

Another example of the systematic deceit practised by these reverend impostors upon Herodotus, is their omission of all mention of the conquest of Egypt by those Asiatic invaders, who under the name of pastor or shepherd kings act so important a part in the more authentic annals of the country, as afterwards compiled in the Alexandrian age by Manetho and Eratosthenes. The wilfulness of the deceit is here apparent through the figurative veil under which the truth has been disguised. After describing (always after his native instructors) several of the largest pyramids as having been built by the forced labour of the population under a dynasty of oppressive monarchs,—in whose time also the temples were shut, and the country in other ways sorely afflicted,—Herodotus adds: that "so great was the hatred of the Egyptians for these kings, that they would not so much as pronounce their names; and that hence the monuments erected by them were commonly called after a certain shepherd named Philitis[1], who about that time pastured his flocks on the surrounding plain."

13. But the most remarkable and valuable peculiarity of the Græco-Egyptian cycle of tradition, and

Sudden transition from my-

[1] II. 128. This shepherd is plainly but a mythical personification of the oppressive dynasty of foreign pastor sovereigns. His name Philitis also appears to be an equally obvious variety of that of Philistim or Philistine, originally borrowed by the pastor race from Pheles or Pelusium (the Goshen of Scripture, the part of Egypt in which they first settled), and afterwards carried by them, when expelled from that country, into Philistia or Palestine. That their expulsion took place not long before the settlement of the Hebrews in Egypt, appears from a passage of Chronicles (VII. 21.), where two sons of Ephraim, Ezer and Elead, then dwelling in Egypt, are described as having been slain by "the men of Gath (Philistines), who were born in that land;" the land namely then occupied by the Israelites, from which the Philistines then settled in Gath had lately been ejected, and into which they naturally continued to make predatory inroads.

thical to real in the Egyptian annals.

which distinguishes it from the parallel legends of the Asiatic nations, is the suddenness with which it emerges, about a century and a half prior to its close, from the mists of mythology, and assumes the character of authentic history. The account given by Herodotus of the circumstances which led to this transition is as distinct as it is important. Prior to the time of Psammetichus, fourth king of Manetho's xxvith dynasty (670 B. C.), foreigners, he informs us, had been denied free access to, or residence in, Egypt. This monarch, having been indebted to a body of Greek piratical adventurers for valuable services against rival pretenders to the throne, took them permanently into his pay, and settled them with their women and children in the country. From this epoch large bands of Hellenic mercenaries formed, like the Swiss in the monarchies of modern Europe, the most loyal portion of the Egyptian army. Psammetichus also caused young Egyptians to be instructed by the colonists in the Hellenic language and customs[1]; and from those so qualified sprang the interpreters who attended Greek travellers in Egypt. "Hence it is," the historian adds, "that since the epoch of Psammetichus the Greeks possess a more accurate knowledge of the affairs of Egypt, and a general harmony exists between the Greek and the Egyptian accounts of its history." Accordingly, from the accession of this sovereign, the Egyptian tradition of Herodotus, instead of that confused tissue of fables of which it was previously made up, offers a continuous record of events which, as tested by the contemporaneous native monuments and by the parallel light

[1] II. 154.

of sacred history, may advance as good a claim to historical accuracy as the annals of Greece during the Persian war. It were indeed under any circumstances to have been expected, that the tradition of this latter period, from 700 B. C. downwards, as more recent, should have a better chance of being true than that relating to the thousands of years which preceded; but it was not natural that, without some special cause, the transition from fable to fact should be as sudden as in the present case. Here then we have an example of the superior value which the oral tradition of one period may possess over that of another, owing to the influence of incidental circumstances. Those circumstances were here the existence of Greek colonies in Egypt, and the consequent check which the collateral and more impartial course of alien tradition placed on the license of the native authorities. For the Egyptian history of Herodotus, whether derived from indigenous or from Hellenic sources, still remains tradition; there being no reason to believe that his countrymen settled in Egypt kept more regular records of the affairs of their adopted country than their kinsmen at home of those of the parent states. The argument may be further illustrated by the parallel cases of Media and Lydia. The foundation of the Median empire is, in the chronology of Herodotus, nearly contemporaneous with the accession of Psammetichus; but the accounts of that foundation, of the founder, of the dynasty which he established, and of the events in which it terminated, are as fabulous as they are contradictory. Had Greek colonies been settled in Media at the same time as in Egypt, our notices of the former country during the subsequent period might have been as distinct as those of

Egypt since Psammetichus. The case of Lydia, on the other hand, resembles that of Egypt. The numerous Greek colonies settled in and around the Lydian territory, secured to the tradition of the Mermnadæ, in substance at least, an authenticity similar to that which the later Egyptian dynasties owed to a similar cause.

Blending of Egyptian and Greek mythology.

The establishment of these colonies by Psammetichus, with the measures adopted by himself and his successors for the spread of the Greek tongue in Egypt, also explains a peculiarity which, in the page of Herodotus, distinguishes the theological element of Egyptian fable from that of oriental fable: the greater extent to which the former is mixed up with the native Greek mythology. The Greek colonists have here evidently lent their aid to the work of fiction, as effectually as to the cause of truth in secular history. A large portion of the mythical anecdotes introduced by Herodotus to season the dryness of Egyptian history, are pure Greek fables, incorporated by the Egyptian archæologers, very clumsily in most cases, with their own genuine legends, for the purpose of indulging and encouraging the popular notion of the Greeks as to the connexion of their own system of mythology with that of Egypt. A few examples are subjoined:

At Chemmis, a city of upper Egypt, Herodotus[1] was shown a fine temple, with a grove of palm trees, dedicated, as the local antiquaries assured him, to Perseus son of Danaë, adorned with the hero's statue and that of his mother, and where gymnastic games were held in his honour. The account given by the

same authorities of the origin of this sanctuary was, "That Perseus was himself a citizen of Chemmis in right of his grandfather Danaus, who was a native of the town; that the hero, having been informed by his mother of the particulars of his origin and ancestry, had, when on his expedition to Libya to fetch the Gorgon's head, been at pains to visit the seat of his forefathers; that he was honourably received, both by his own relatives and the other citizens, who had decreed him a temple and divine honours; and that he had since been in the habit, from time to time, of repeating his visits to the place." In proof of the latter assertion they showed Herodotus a sandal, which the hero on one of these visits had accidentally left behind him; and the finding of which caused an unusually abundant harvest throughout Egypt. What may have been the real name or character of this deity we shall not here inquire. This much must be apparent to every one at all conversant with the true spirit of the Egyptian theology, that the account given to Herodotus is a fiction from beginning to end; a fiction concocted by the priests on the basis of foreign legends supplied by the Hellenic colonists, for the purpose of deluding confiding Greek travellers; and with good success apparently, in the case of Herodotus. Equally absurd is the story of the king Proteus, into whom the same ingenious mythographers converted the sea-god of the Odyssey; and their version of Homer's legend of the adventures of Menelaus and Helen in Egypt, on which the historian has a most elaborate commentary.[1] In some other

[1] II. 112. sqq.: conf. infra, Ch. vi. § 13., for additional proof of the repugnance of all these stories to the genuine Egyptian mythology.

instances we find the Egyptians themselves resisting the attempts to palm European fables on their legendarium, when the proposed innovations appeared less creditable to their national dignity. The story, for example, of the Greek Hercules having been seized on his passage through Egypt, of his having been led out bound as a sacrifice to Jupiter, and having, on his approach to the altar, burst his bands and slain the whole multitude assembled to witness his immolation, though quite as good a one in itself as the Chemmite account of his ancestor Perseus, is dismissed as an idle Greek fiction.[1] The mode in which this spurious species of mythology was gradually worked up, is further illustrated by the attempt which seems to have been making in the time of Herodotus, to appropriate to the Helleno-Thracian courtesan Rhodopis the honour of having erected one of the larger pyramids; an absurdity which Herodotus does not consider unworthy of an elaborate confutation.[2]

Geographical research of Herodotus.

In regard to the greater part of the historian's geographical information, we possess an important source of strictly authentic evidence which fails in the purely historical element of his narrative; his own testimony as a contemporary and an eye-witness; as a traveller in, and observer of, the countries described. Wherever he speaks in this capacity his personal credit is a sufficient voucher for the truth of what he states. The case is different where, as a geographer also, he is dependent on the statements of others. The temptations to fraud, with the facilities for its exercise on the part of second-hand authorities,

[1] II. 45.

[2] II. 134. sq.

were even greater in matters of geographical than of historical inquiry; such temptations being limited in the latter case chiefly to the past, and to events preceding the age of the inquirer; but in the former case extending also frequently to the present. Even the boldest vender of fictions would hardly venture to state to a younger contemporary a broad falsehood regarding events of his own early days, where it would be so easy, from honester sources, to evict the fraud. But the native of a remote country, or a traveller returned from exploring it, would have less scruple in diverting himself, if so inclined, at the expense of those who were not likely to obtain similar means of testing his veracity. Hence, while the greater part of the geographical information given by Herodotus as the result of his own experience is ascertained to be true, and the remainder, where no such proof of his good faith can be produced, is either probable or credible, there is no portion of his work, as will be seen in the sequel, where impossibilities and improbabilities are more profusely accumulated than in his accounts at second hand of regions not visited by himself.

## CHAP. VI.

### HERODOTUS: HIS TREATMENT OF HIS MATERIALS.

1. MERITS AND DEFECTS OF HERODOTUS AS A HISTORICAL AUTHORITY. TO BE ESTIMATED IN THE SPIRIT OF HIS AGE. — 2. HIS RELIGION AND SUPERSTITION. — 3. INFLUENCE OF HIS SUPERSTITION ON HIS JUDGEMENT. ORACLES. OMENS AND PRODIGIES. DREAMS. — 4. HIS THEORIES OF INTERPRETATION. DIRECT INTERPOSITION OF THE GODS. HIS RESERVE CONCERNING THE "MYSTERIES."—5. HIS THEORY OF SPECIAL NEMESIS. CRŒSUS. CAMBYSES. CLEOMENES.—6. MURDER OF THE PERSIAN ENVOYS. XERXES AND ARTABANUS. — 7. HIS LOVE OF THE MARVELLOUS. PERSIAN SKULL. BALD MEN AND GOAT-FOOTED MEN. HIS THEORY OF THE MARVELLOUS. — 8. EXTREMITIES OF THE EARTH. GOLD REGIONS. MARVELS OF INDIA. ETHIOPIA. HYPERBOREANS. ARABIA. LIBYA. ECCENTRIC CUSTOMS.—9. IMPOSITIONS PRACTISED ON HERODOTUS. — 10. HIS EXCURSIVE ANECDOTES AND HISTORICAL GOSSIP. CORINTHIAN HISTORY AND COURT SCANDAL. — 11. SOLON. SPARTO-MESSENIAN WARS. CYRENE. AFFAIRS OF SAMOS. — 12. HIS SPIRIT OF HYPERBOLE. EXPEDITION OF XERXES. — 13. HIS SELF-CONTRADICTIONS. THE BATTLE OF MARATHON. IGNORANCE OF THE GREEK MARINERS. PERSIAN IGNORANCE OF GREECE. EGYPTIAN ECCENTRICITY. — 14. CLAIMS OF HERODOTUS TO RANK AS A CRITICAL HISTORIAN. SCYTHIAN EXPEDITION OF DARIUS. ESTIMATE OF DISTANCE BY DAYS' JOURNEYS. — 15. ESTIMATE OF TIME BY GENERATIONS, AND BY REIGNS OF KINGS. WANT OF A STANDARD CHRONOLOGICAL ERA. OTHER NUMERICAL ANOMALIES. BATTLE OF THERMOPYLÆ —16. INVASION OF EGYPT BY CAMBYSES. WALLS OF BABYLON. — 17. PERSIAN LOVE OF DEMOCRACY. — 18. HISTORIAN'S GEOGRAPHICAL CRITICISM. CIRCUMNAVIGATION OF AFRICA. CASPIAN SEA. CHANGES OF SEASONS. RISE OF THE NILE. — 19. HIS PHILOLOGICAL CRITICISM. HIS MYTHOLOGICAL CRITICISM. — 20. HIS IMPARTIALITY. CHARACTER OF THE PERSIANS. — 21. HIS IMPUTED FAVOUR TO THE ATHENIANS, AND INJUSTICE TO THE CORINTHIANS. — 22. HIS JUDGEMENT OF THE THESSALIANS, ARGIVES, THEBANS, MINOR GREEK STATES. — 23. ANTAGONISM OF THEBES AND ATHENS. "MALIGNITY" OF HERODOTUS.

Merits and defects of Herodotus as a historical authority.

1. HITHERTO we have considered the research of Herodotus rather with reference to the data by which it was guided, than to the mode in which he has availed himself of those data. A certain share of consideration has, it is true, been given also to the latter subject, the two being in some measure in-

separable. It will now be proper to direct attention more particularly to the historical merits of the work as dependent on those of the author; to the degree of sound judgement or good faith displayed by him in the treatment of the materials which the zeal and diligence of his investigation had placed at his disposal.

There can be no doubt that Herodotus was, according to the standard of his age and country, a sensible and intelligent man, as well as a writer of power and genius, and that he possessed an extensive knowledge of human life and character. Still less can it reasonably be questioned that he was an essentially honest and veracious historian. Such he has been admitted to be by the more impartial judges both of his own and subsequent periods of antient literature, and by the all but unanimous verdict of the modern public. Rigid in fact as has been the scrutiny to which his text has been subjected, no distinct case of wilful misstatement or perversion of fact has been substantiated against him. On the contrary, the very severity of the ordeal has often been the means of eliciting evidence of his truth in cases where, with the greatest temptation to falsehood, there was the least apparent risk of detection. Every portion indeed of his work is pervaded by an air of candour and honest intention, which the discerning critic must recognise as reflecting corresponding qualities in the author. We may therefore, as a general rule, rest satisfied that the properly historical portions of his narrative, even where not positively authenticated, are at least digested in what appeared to him the most accurate manner, according to what he believed to be the most trustworthy authorities.

But while thus doing full justice both to the intellectual and moral attributes of the historian, we cannot overlook the fact, that there were secondary causes inherent in his own genius and in that of his age tending to counteract, often in a very serious degree, the beneficial exercise of his talents, and to render him at times, unconsciously perhaps and with the best intentions, a partial and superficial as well as an erroneous reporter of facts and events. We shall here briefly enumerate the more prominent of these causes, and endeavour in the sequel by examples to illustrate their effects.

First, the influence which the popular superstition of his age exercised on his judgement.

Secondly, his love of the marvellous, as observed or imagined by him in the ordinary phenomena of nature apart from divine or preternatural agency.

Thirdly, his desire to impart variety and effect to his narrative, by interesting or entertaining anecdotes, striking historical combinations, and other similar expedients.

The first two of the above three causes might be classed conjointly under the general head of Credulity. The charge of credulity which we have ventured to prefer against Herodotus is one the abstract validity of which even his most ardent admirers have rarely, if ever, ventured to deny. It is one, however, which they have very generally exerted themselves to evade, by palliating, explaining away, or even justifying the defect imputed, in such a manner as to render the charge itself ineffective or nugatory. The more comprehensive ground of apology has been, that Herodotus was credulous only in so far as he belonged to an age of universal credulity, and only in

To be estimated in the spirit of his age.

matters a belief in which, according to the then existing standard of science and civilisation, was not considered incompatible with good sense and sound judgement in the general affairs of life; while the few who affected to be raised above such vulgar impressions were viewed, and often with justice, rather as presumptuous sceptics, than esteemed as men of liberal minds. The tendency of this apology, even if valid, would be, more perhaps than that of the imputation which it repudiates, to depreciate the character of the historian. If Herodotus is to be ranked among the ordinary men of his age, he may then fairly be judged by the standard of ordinary men. But if he is to be ranked, as it has here been proposed to rank him, among the master minds of his age, he must be judged by the standard of those master minds. There can however be no doubt that many of the other great intellects of his time stood, in regard to this particular, on a different ground from that which he himself occupies. Herodotus was contemporaneous with Pericles and Anaxagoras, with Thucydides and Aristophanes. Of the two former he was a greatly younger contemporary. He was yet a boy when Pericles had begun to direct the destinies of Athens. His own age and habits of thought, therefore, might have been identified with the more advanced state of enlightenment which Pericles had bequeathed. The comparative freedom of these four remarkable men from the petty superstitions and prejudices which exercised so powerful a sway on the mind of Herodotus, abundantly shows that the term "spirit of the age," as here employed by his apologists, must be restricted to the vulgar or

popular spirit, as distinct from that of the historian's more enlightened contemporaries.

To palliate this defect on the ground here proposed would be doing Herodotus injustice in two ways; first by degrading him, as a subject of critical biography, to a lower level than that on which he deserves to stand; secondly, by blinding ourselves to a prominent characteristic of his genius. The anomalies of such a genius, even when constituting blemishes, always supply subject of interesting contemplation to the student of human nature; and a striking anomaly in the genius of Herodotus is precisely this combination of sound judgement, and even at times critical scepticism, in the real affairs of life, with an almost puerile deficiency of the same faculties as brought to bear on the concerns of the world unknown, real or imaginary. Nor is this peculiarity of human character, if such it be, one of rare occurrence: but might be exemplified in the case of remarkable men of every age, not excepting that in which we live, boasting, as it justly may, a degree of enlightenment far exceeding that of the most enlightened period of Greek civilisation.

Restricting however, as above proposed, in this particular case, the term Spirit of the age to its vulgar or popular spirit, it may truly be said that the historian was, both in this and in almost every other prominent trait of his character, the ennobled type of the vulgar or popular genius of Hellenism; and that too of an earlier stage of Hellenism even than the one in which he himself flourished. Every reader who has studied the general progress of Greek social life during the fifth and sixth centuries B.C., must have felt, in perusing the history of Herodotus, that its author was

a man of primitive habits and ideas, whose feelings were associated with what is familiarly called "the good old time," rather than with the age in which he lived. We continually forget, when thoroughly identified with the spirit of his narrative, though frequently reminded by the letter of his text, that he lived and wrote during the stirring vicissitudes, social and political, of the Peloponnesian war; and figure him to ourselves rather as a contemporary of the Solon, the Crœsus, or the Miltiades, whom he celebrates, than of the orators, sophists, and philosophers of the public for which he wrote.

It is only by a right appreciation of these peculiarities of the historian's genius that we can do justice either to himself or to his work. Such however, it is to be feared, is not the mode in which he has been usually judged by his modern commentators. Their treatises are, for the most part, little more than eulogies qualified by a few gentle strictures insufficient to maintain even the semblance of critical impartiality. Dazzled by the rich profusion of his historical facts, by the grandeur of his historical combinations, by the charm of his style, by the truthfulness of intention and amiability of temper which beam in every page, and by the entertainment derived even from the defective portions of his narrative, they are led to place his work and himself, in regard to the higher qualifications of the historian, on the same level with that occupied by Thucydides; and then, with a natural anxiety to maintain him at that level, are in the habit of dismissing with a few apologetic remarks those other less creditable characteristics, a due consideration of which is indispensable to a right estimate of his genius.

His religion and superstition.

2. As introductory to any remarks on the "credulity of Herodotus," in its more immediate connexion with the prevailing superstition of his age, it will be proper to take a concise view of his religious opinions in general. Every part of his work exhibits a mind impressed with a strong sense of the fundamental truths of natural religion; of the all-pervading power and influence of the Deity; of the unerring course of his retributive justice; of the weakness and vanity of his human creatures, and of their obligation to implicit reliance on his providence and pious submission to his decrees. Thus far the primary elements of the historian's religious faith rest on a solid basis of reason and philosophy, and are frequently inculcated with a moral dignity of sentiment and expression, which strangely contrasts with the respect elsewhere shown by him for the variety of modes in which those essential truths were corrupted or perverted in the popular paganism of his day.

The foundation of his own creed was the dogma of Fatality or Predestination; a dogma common to him, not only with the standard theologians of primitive Greece, but with those of purer systems of religion. It is one as undeniable in theory, as it is difficult to reconcile in practice with those other essential truths which, whether in pagan or in christian countries, render the influence of religion actively beneficial in the conduct of human affairs. Herodotus seems to have been aware of this difficulty; for the despotic supremacy of Fate over the thoughts and actions of men, while fully recognised in his system, and productive occasionally of somewhat strange anomalies, is seldom put forward in a prominent form, or pointedly enforced in practice. Men are every where as-

sumed to be in so far free agents as to be responsible to the gods; on whose favour they establish a claim by their virtues and great actions, while their crimes and follies are visited sooner or later with divine vengeance. The gods, while subject in theory to the same primary law of Fate, and acting but as ministers of her decrees, are also represented, in the exercise of their functions, as independent powers, controlling and directing the affairs of men, chiefly by means of oracles, prodigies, omens, dreams, or even, though more rarely, by immediate personal interposition.

It is remarkable that the expression God, in the historian's ordinary allusions to the controlling power of Providence, is almost invariably used in the singular number. This would seem to imply the recognition of a certain unity in the Deity, distinct from, and prior to, his material personification in the divinities of the Greek pantheon. Not, however, that there is any trace of scepticism on the part of Herodotus as to the real personality of those divinities. On the contrary, there is no antient author who displays a more orthodox belief in their corporeal existence. He also speculates, at some detail, on their origin and attributes, and on their relation to the gods of other nations. On this latter point he has his theory; according to which the principal gods of all countries were fundamentally the same; different developments, that is, of the same fundamental ideas. Each god of each nation is a personification of some quality or power; which quality or power may be embodied in a different form and under a different denomination, according to the variety of local circumstances, in the person of some corresponding

deity of another nation. The Jupiter of the Greeks was the same being essentially as the Ammon of the Egyptians or the Belus of the Assyrians; the Minerva of the Greeks the same as the Neit of the Egyptians and the Tritonis of the Libyans. Some nations had more, some fewer of these deities; but the few of the one seldom failed to find their counterpart among the many of the others. The gods of some countries were more antient than those of others; according to the relative antiquity of their population or civilisation. In such cases, the common elementary idea personified by each deity was understood to be communicated by the older to the younger nation. The gods of Greece were chiefly imported from Egypt, partly by the primeval Pelasgic race of Hellas, partly by their descendants the Hellenes; and the cruder forms under which they were first adopted and worshipped were matured into the existing system by Homer and Hesiod.[1] The historian is at great pains to investigate the chronological points involved in this portion of his system. The question as to the relative antiquity of the Greek, the Egyptian, and the Phœnician Hercules, costs him several voyages, from Egypt to Tyre, from Tyre to Thasos[2], and as many pages of subtle disquisition. All the gods of all nations being thus in one mode or other representatives or agents of the divine power, are all worthy of pious veneration; however absurd or monstrous the form in which they are worshipped by one people may appear to another: and the phrensy with which Cambyses was visited in his latter days is attributed, very pointedly, to the insult and ridicule

[1] II. 53. [2] II. 44.

with which he treated, as it was very natural a Persian sun-worshipper should treat, the burlesque monstrosities of the Egyptian pantheon; especially its bull Apis, and its deformed dwarf Phthah.[1]

None of these articles of the historian's religious faith, if judged in the spirit of his age, need necessarily expose him to any serious charge of superstitious weakness. It is however by the mode in which they are brought into practical operation in his narrative, that our estimate of them must here be guided. The same rules formerly laid down in the parallel case of Homer, apply also to the case of Herodotus. We then took occasion to remark, that the belief in a special providence, or direct interposition of the Deity in human affairs, is a principle of natural religion common to the most enlightened with the most barbarous states of society; and one which in every age is viewed with respect, even by those who may be least susceptible of its influence. But we also drew attention to the anomalous though reasonable distinction, that such impressions are so viewed, or deserve to be so viewed, by intelligent men, only in so far as produced by the more momentous vicissitudes of human destiny; that when brought to bear on the ordinary transactions of life they are apt to excite contempt rather than respect; and that hence, what in one stage of the same train of moral sentiment is esteemed the philosophy of religion, degenerates in another into bigotry and superstition.

Influence of his superstition on his judgement.

3. The impartial critic can have no hesitation in deciding to which of these two categories the theory of divine mechanism inculcated by Herodotus is to be

[1] III. 38. alibi.

assigned; and will pronounce the childish simplicity with which the historian recognises such petty exercise of preternatural influence on the events which he describes, to be as prejudicial to his historical research as it is discreditable to his judgement. A man morbidly intent on bringing all the affairs of life into connexion with some special display of divine interposition, could hardly fail to be influenced in his choice or treatment of the various traditions current relative to past events, by a pious consideration of the degree in which effect was given by one or other of them to his favourite theory. Accordingly, every part of the historian's work bears testimony, in the greater or less accumulation of oracles, prodigies, dreams, and the like, to the mode in which his researches must have been affected by this weakness of his character.

A copious illustration of what has here been said has already[1] been derived from the biography of Crœsus; and the argument might be extended over the remainder of the first book of the historian's work. The events there treated hinge on a mythological mechanism comprising thirteen prodigies or omens, upwards of twenty oracles, and four prophetic dreams. These trivialities are, upon the whole, most plentiful in the portion of the text which treats of remoter times and countries. But they abound also in the narrative of strictly historical events, wherever the subject becomes more than usually interesting. The sixth book, containing the account of the battle of Marathon, has, in about one half the number of pages comprised in the first, nine pro-

[1] Supra, Ch. v. p. 324. sq.

digies, three dreams, and three oracles. The eighth, containing the battle of Salamis, has ten prodigies and seven oracles. With regard to the previous question: how far this peculiarity of Herodotus is to be considered as reflecting the "spirit of his age," it may be remarked, that in the entire work of Thucydides, in all essential respects a contemporaneous historian, there occurs neither prodigy nor dream; and the few oracles mentioned are noticed merely as historical facts, without the least appearance on the author's part of confidence in their efficacy. The importance attached even by Herodotus to this class of divine agency appears the more strange, coupled as it is with his own repeated exposures of the frauds practised by the Delphic priestess on her devotees, under the influence of a bribery and corruption which seem to have been as habitual at Delphi as in any English parliamentary borough. It was by bribes of money, he tells us [1], that the Alcmæonidæ, when driven from Athens by the Pisistratidæ, induced the Pythoness to coerce the Spartans to aid the Athenians in their efforts to expel the usurpers. It was by like means [2] that Cleomenes king of Sparta secured the assistance of the oracle in his plot against his colleague Demaratus, who by the same pseudo-divine agency is deposed, and Leotychides the fellow-conspirator of Cleomenes reigns in his stead. The destinies of Greece are thus acknowledged by the devoutly confiding Herodotus himself, to depend on the caprice of a single dishonest and mercenary woman. It may also not be superfluous to remark, for the benefit of those pious

Oracles.

[1] v. 63.

[2] VI. 66.

persons who incline to believe in the reality of a demoniac inspiration having been for some wise purpose conceded by the true God to the Delphic Apollo, that the few oracles mentioned by Herodotus as delivered but not yet fulfilled in his time, remain unfulfilled to the present day.[1]

Omens and prodigies, their frivolity.

The frivolity of some of the miraculous manifestations recorded by him is very remarkable. He seems often to have been at pains to wring them from the very dregs of the popular superstition. Such is his account of the long beard which sprouted on the chin of the Pedasian priestess on the approach of any calamitous event[2]; a phenomenon which he not only states as a fact, but as one of repeated occurrence. Such are the stories of the snakes swarming in the streets of Sardis and the horses hurrying from the neighbouring pastures to eat them up[3]; of the tooth dropped in a fit of coughing by the superannuated tyrant Hippias on the shore of Marathon, ominous of the failure of that enterprise[4]; of the mare which gave birth to a hare, while the host of Xerxes was marching over the bridge of the Hellespont[5]; of the cloud of dust that

[1] VIII. 141., IX. 43.

[2] I. 175. He does not tell us what became of the beard after the event portended had taken place; whether it dropped off or was shaved, for one or other must be presumed, in order to make way for the next divine manifestation of the same kind.

[3] I. 78.

[4] VI. 107. Who can doubt, had the enterprise succeeded, that the dropping of the tooth on Attic soil would have been recognised as an omen that Hippias was to be restored to his native land, and his bones to rest tranquilly in the tomb of his ancestors? The previous dream of the old tyrant, ἐδόκεε τῇ μητρὶ τῇ ἑωυτοῦ συνεννηθῆναι (loc. cit.), was a graver matter than the loss of a tooth: but his interpretation of it, though in conformity with the critical rules of divination in such cases, was falsified by the event.

[5] VII. 57.

appeared to Demaratus[1] on the plain of Eleusis; of the resuscitation of the salt-fish roasting on the fire at Sestus.[2] Herodotus, with less taste than Homer in the selection, shows, like that poet, a certain partiality in his mythological mechanism for particular animals. The capture of the mighty Babylon is foreshadowed[3] by the foaling of a mule. The passage of Xerxes with his five millions of men from Asia to Europe is figured, through a slight improvement of the same prodigy, by a mule bringing forth a foal possessing the attributes of both sexes.[4] Of this "mighty omen," as he describes it, and of the birth of the hare which occurred simultaneously, "Xerxes," says the historian, evidently surprised and offended at his scepticism, "took no account whatever." Among the immediate causes of the downfall of the Lydian empire was the slowness of Crœsus or his soothsayers to perceive, when the Pythoness pronounced[5] that a mule should sit on the throne of the Medes, that the mule in question was Cyrus, so designated in right of his birth from a Persian father and a Median mother. Some of these legends afford, in their own tenor, a clue to their origin in the popular proverbs or local gossip of the places where the omens were manifested. In the prodigy of the mare giving birth to a hare, the moral is identical with that conveyed in another very antient, and to the English reader more familiar proverb, of the mountain giving birth to a mouse. The horse is the animal typical in all ages of ostentatious martial spirit, the hare of timidity and flight. It might naturally occur to some humourist of the Hellespontine district, after the humiliating discomfiture of

[1] VIII. 65. [2] IX. 120. [3] III. 153.
[4] VII. 57. [5] I. 55.

Xerxes, to contrast the splendour of his outset with his disgraceful flight homewards by this figurative adage; and the transition from a proverb illustrative of the vicissitudes of the mighty monarch to a prodigy portending them was easy and natural.[1]

Dreams.

The most powerfully efficacious of these supernatural warnings appears, in the estimation of Herodotus, to have been the dream; and it is surprising how many of the more important events recorded by him are regulated solely or chiefly by this agency. On the dream of the last Median monarch Astyages[2] hinges the whole series of fatalities which caused the transfer of the empire of Asia from the Medes to the Persians. It is by a dream that Cambyses is instigated[3] to murder his brother Smerdis; which act of atrocity produces the temporary reign of the Magi, and the permanent alteration of the line of succession to the Persian throne; and, not to mention numerous minor instances, the invasion of Greece by Xerxes is brought about[4] by a continued and systematic intervention on the part of the same wily race of dæmons.[5]

[1] The narrative of Herodotus supplies other examples of the mode in which such popular sayings may change their scope and character. The antient name of Lampsacus was Pityusa, or the City of pine trees. Hence Crœsus, when displeased with its inhabitants, threatens to "root them out as he would a pine tree." Herodotus, unconscious of the true import of the menace, which to an intelligent local interpreter would have been obvious, explains it (VI. 37.) at some length as a figure of the the utter destruction of the offending community; "the pine," he adds, "being a tree which when cut over sends forth no saplings from the root." The origin of such miracles as the resuscitation of the salt-fish, also receives light from the elegant fable placed in the mouth of Cyrus during his early dealings with the Hellenic states. (I. 141.) Cf. p. 306. supra.

[2] I. 107. sqq. [3] III. 30. [4] VII. 12. sq.

[5] Nothing can be more frivolous and absurd than the theory of dreams propounded through the medium of Artabanus in VII. 16.

His theories of interpretation.

4. Some of the rules laid down by Herodotus for the right interpretation of such portentous warnings, throw a curious light on the extent of his own hallucination in these matters. When describing the capture of the isle of Chios by Histiæus, he observes[1]: "that the gods are accustomed to foreshadow the approach of any great calamity by a previous succession of minor calamities"; and mentions two or three disasters which had lately befallen the Chians, as a foretaste of the greater disaster which now overtook them. But in the case of Polycrates of Samos an opposite rule is laid down.[2] We are there told that great reverses of destiny are usually portended by an uninterrupted course of previous good fortune; and this doctrine is exemplified by a long narrative of the exertions made by Polycrates, but in vain, to infuse into his hitherto unalloyed prosperity a small ingredient of self-inflicted misfortune, as a means of averting his impending destruction.

Direct interposition of the gods.

The direct personal interference of the Deity, though more rare in the mythology of Herodotus than in that of Homer, is not excluded. Helen appears[3] in her temple at Therapna to the wife of Ariston king of Sparta, and confers on her the gift of transcendant beauty. The same Spartan queen afterwards declares to her son Demaratus[4] that he was begotten by the household god of the family, who by the popular Amphitryonic stratagem had assumed her husband's place in her bed. Phidippides, the Athenian herald sent to demand succour from Sparta on the invasion of Attica by Datis and Artaphernes, is accosted[5] on his way across mount Parthenius by the god Pan, who

[1] VI. 27. [2] III. 40. sq. [3] VI. 61.
[4] VI. 69. [5] VI. 105.

expresses his friendly feeling towards the Athenians, and instructs Phidippides, on his return to Athens, to demand for him a temple and public worship, with which he had not hitherto been honoured in that state. The Persians in their attempt on Delphi are assaulted[1] by two local deities of the sanctuary, Phylacus and Antinoüs; and at the commencement of the battle of Salamis, when a portion of the Greek fleet showed but little ardour for the attack, a martial female figure, Minerva it may be presumed, appeared[2], and reproaching them with their backwardness urged them on to victory. These phantom warriors are of frequent occurrence in the more recent Greek mythology. Another who fought on the side of the Persians at the battle of Marathon, is stated by Herodotus to have struck blind an Athenian combatant named Epizelus, and slain his neighbour in the ranks.[3] A phantom ship was also described in the Athenian tradition as having appeared during the battle of Salamis[4], for the purpose of rallying the fugitive Corinthian squadron. Considering the gravity with which Herodotus narrates these and other similar stories, and the positive faith which to all appearance he placed in several of them, he is hardly entitled to stigmatise, as he does in very contemptuous terms[5], the simplicity of the Athenian populace, in so readily believing a tall handsome woman whom Pisistratus dressed in armour and seated by his side in his

[1] VIII. 39. [2] VIII. 84.

[3] VI. 117. This story may be collated with another introduced in our biography of Stesichorus; where the blindness of that poet is not caused, but cured, through the instrumentality of another martial phantom, who fought on the side of the Locrians in an engagement with the Crotoniates.

[4] VIII. 94. [5] I. 60.

chariot, to be Minerva; and in allowing him to drive, under the auspices of this sham goddess, into the city, and reestablish the tyranny of which they had lately dispossessed him.

His pious reserve concerning the "Mysteries."

The pains which Herodotus has taken to collect mythical anecdotes of this entertaining class, and the satisfaction with which he relates them, are curiously contrasted with his silence in regard to every point of religious belief or ceremonial partaking of the character of what was called a mystery in the Greek theology. The examples of this pious reserve occur chiefly in his description of Egypt. They illustrate in a striking manner the profound veneration which the whole tenor of his Egyptian narrative shows him to have felt for the faith and worship of that country; a veneration which, judging from the specimens of doctrine or rite most prominently noticed by him, would seem to have been very much in the ratio of the frivolity of the objects on which it was bestowed. The passages of his second book[1] in which he intimates his sense of this obligation to mysterious silence are upwards of twelve in number; and the successively recurring announcements are made in such similar phraseology, as to amount to a sort of epic commonplace of his Egyptian narrative. The obligation itself extends not only to rites and doctrines, but to divine names or epithets, described by him[2] as too ineffably sacred to be uttered by uninitiated lips or conveyed to unsanctified ears.

His theory of Nemesis.

5. Even where the historian's religious enthusiasm displays itself, as it often does, in forms more creditable to his taste or judgement, in a deep sense

[1] 3. 47. 51. 61, 62. 65. 81. 171., &c.
[2] 86. 132. 170.

of the pervading influence of Divine providence, and of the unerring course of retributive justice, it may yet be a question how far the mode in which his devotional feelings are brought to bear on his historical research, can be considered as more conducive to its accuracy than in the cases already examined. Every act of signal folly or injustice, especially where committed in the face of some celestial warning, is represented as the object of a special Nemesis; and as visited, sooner or later, on the guilty person himself or his descendants, with its proper meed of retributive vengeance. In the application of this common law of Nemesis to the course of human vicissitude described in his narrative, the historian is guided as in other similar cases by a favourite theory of his own. The main cause of crime and calamity in the world is, according to this theory, the pride and presumption of powerful and ambitious men. These defects of human character are represented as the chief objects of the anger, or as Herodotus defines it[1], the Jealousy of the Deity, against what he regards as impious attempts of his creatures to arrogate the glory or grandeur which justly belongs to himself alone. Even the bare possession of great power or wealth, apart from any pernicious use of them, is represented[2] as rendering men objects of this jealousy, and exposing them, as such, to special risk of calamitous reverses; unless the hostile influence be propitiated by an humble and grateful sense of the divine bounty from which such worldly advantages proceed. This idea is one of those uppermost in the historian's mind throughout the composition of his

[1] I. 32. 34., III. 40., VII. 46. 203., VIII. 109.
[2] I. 34., III. 40., VII. 203.

work, recurring from time to time as the pivot around which revolve all his reflexions on human destiny, and his illustrations of human vicissitude. It offers nothing in itself derogatory to his moral or religious character. But the mode in which it is worked out in detail is, perhaps, even more prejudicial to the authenticity of his narrative than his pettier vein of popular superstition. Wherever, in the current accounts, the latter days of a personage of note were marked by any of those reverses of fortune, which in the theory of Herodotus were the result of the divine jealousy and its attendant Nemesis; or where, on the other hand, the life of some such personage had been sullied by crimes provocative of that Nemesis; it was natural that the desire to bring, in either case, the course of such a man's destiny into that providential relation of cause and effect on which the theory was founded, should influence the historian's choice of the several versions of the story which in almost every such case were open to his adoption. He has accordingly been at great pains to establish instances of such retributive dispensation, often at the expense of some subtle disquisition; especially where, as frequently happens, he is under the necessity of deciding among the several crimes and follies of remarkably wicked or foolish men, on the particular crime or folly against which a particular Nemesis was directed. A few examples are subjoined:

Crœsus.

In treating of the life of Solon in a former chapter it was observed, that the legend of his visit to Crœsus king of Lydia is one of the most apocryphal parts of the biography of each of these celebrated personages. It was one, consequently, in dealing with

which critical caution was especially required. We have also seen that the main facts of the historian's version of that legend are inconsistent with the parallel course of contemporaneous history as narrated in his own pages. The mode, on the other hand, in which the story is worked up, and the moral lessons it is made to inculcate, are but a continued application of his own favourite Nemesiac theory. The whole beautiful dialogue between the philosopher and the king turns on the vainglorious self-confidence displayed by the latter in the magnitude and permanence of his existing prosperity; while his subsequent misfortunes are recognised by the unfortunate monarch himself on the pile[1], in his emphatic invocation of "Solon," as a divine retribution on his past impiety. The internal evidence, therefore, of the episode betrays the source of the historical blunders which it involves.

Cambyses.

Cambyses, the Persian emperor, is described by Herodotus as having slain the divine Egyptian ox Apis by smiting him with his sword on the thigh.[2] To this outrage on their favourite god the Egyptians, with the historian's concurrence, attributed the phrensy with which its author was soon after visited. Cambyses is described in the sequel as dying of a wound accidentally inflicted by himself, in mounting his horse, with the same weapon and on the same part of the body on which he had wounded Apis. The historian adds that this event, as had been foretold by an oracle of the Egyptian goddess Buto, took place at Agbatana; not the Median metropolis, which Cambyses, on account of this oracle, had been in the

[1] I. 34. 86.

[2] III. 29. 64.

habit of studiously avoiding; but at a town or village of the same name on the route from Egypt to Susa. This is evidently the Egyptian account of the matter. The variety of the tradition transmitted by Ctesias was that Cambyses died of an accidental hurt on the thigh, but under different circumstances; the wound having been given with a knife, while the king was amusing himself with some kind of carpenter-work, in his own residence at Babylon.[1] This was the Persian account, and probably the true one[2]; there being nothing in its details tending to throw suspicion on its correctness. The only fact common to the two is, that Cambyses died of a hurt accidentally inflicted by himself on the thigh. The Egyptian part of the story may safely be left to the invention of the priests of Apis and Buto; and the motive for the historian's preference of their version is here, as in the case of Solon, sufficiently obvious. But is it not a remarkable proof of the influence of these petty superstitions on the mind of Herodotus, that among the enormities of such a monster as Cambyses, who had murdered in cold blood many of his own friends as well as of his enemies, inclusive of an amiable and innocent brother and sister, the crime to be prominently put forward as the special cause of divine Nemesis should be a blow given by the royal maniac to an Egyptian ox?

Somewhat similar is the case of another blood- Cleomenes.

[1] Fragm. Ctes. Didot, p. 48.

[2] In the Behistun inscription, however, (Journ. of Asiat. Soc. vol. x. p. 202.) his successor Darius describes him as having died of grief, caused by the troubled state of his kingdom; implying perhaps, by a royal euphemism, that he committed suicide, intentionally, not accidentally as stated by Herodotus and Ctesias.

thirsty monster, Cleomenes king of Sparta, whose doings are described by Herodotus in some detail, inclusive of the ferocious suicide by which they are brought to a close. The historian informs us that the Nemesis by which this act of phrensy was occasioned had been attributed by the popular opinion of the Greeks to four different causes[1]: by the Argives, to his having deliberately massacred six thousand of their fellow-citizens; by the Athenians, to his having ravaged their sacred territory of Eleusis; by the Spartans, to the habits of drinking acquired by him from the Scythian envoys who had lately visited Lacedæmon; and by the other Greeks, to his having bribed the Pythoness to assist him in his attempts to dethrone, on the ground of illegitimate birth, his colleague Demaratus with whom he had a quarrel. The Spartan view of the case was certainly the most rational of the four, and probably the true one. But were it necessary to bring the death of such a man into a relation of Nemesiac cause and effect with any one of the offences above stated, it might have been supposed that a devotee of so amiable a character as Herodotus, would not have hesitated to prefer the wholesale act of human butchery complained of by the Argives. He decides however in favour of the dethronement of Demaratus; not so much evidently on account of any peculiar iniquity of Cleomenes in his dealings with that sovereign; for Demaratus had been as bitter an enemy of Cleomenes as Cleomenes of Demaratus, and had been besides the first aggressor of the two. The act which here presented itself to the superstitious fancy of the historian

[1] VI. 75. sq.

as a more heinous sin than the murder of 6000 men, was the tampering with the honesty of the Pythoness; an impiety, the Nemesis of which ought surely rather to have fallen on that traitress; or on Apollo himself, for allowing his confiding worshippers to be misled by his accredited minister into calamity or crime.

Murder of the Persian heralds.

6. We subjoin one more example, among many, of the shifts to which Herodotus resorts to enforce this favourite theory. When Darius sent heralds to demand allegiance by "Earth and water" from the Greek states[1], those who visited Athens and Sparta were put to death in a very contumelious manner. In the former city they were thrown into a well, in the latter into a pit, and bid "to fetch earth and water for themselves." This is one of the worst outrages of its kind of which we read in the history of the Greek republics; and one of a class involving impiety to the gods as well as injustice among men; the persons of heralds, in the execution of their duties, being held by all the more civilised Pagan nations to be invested with peculiar sanctity. Had therefore either Darius or Xerxes conquered Greece with the armaments successively fitted out against her, and had Herodotus written an account of the catastrophe, there can be little doubt that he would have brought the murder and the conquest into the usual relation of Nemesiac cause and effect; and have pronounced the downfall of Grecian independence a judgement against the two chief states of Hellas for so flagrant an offence against the law of nations. But as the battles of Salamis and Platæa left no room for any

[1] VII. 133. sqq.

such conclusion, some other expedient was required for maintaining the consistency of Nemesis. In regard to the Athenians he admits that he had not been able to discover any case adapted to his purpose. The devastation of their country during the Persian war might, he remarks, have answered sufficiently well, had it not been forestalled for behoof of some other delinquency of that republic, the nature of which he does not specify. But he enters into an elaborate description of the penalty inflicted on the Lacedæmonians. From the period of their offence their sacrifices, he tells us, no longer proved auspicious. The gods therefore required to be appeased. Two Spartiates of high rank, named Sperthias and Bulis, offered themselves as expiatory victims, proceeded to Susa, and presented themselves to the Persian monarch, who generously sends them back unscathed to their own country. But the will sufficed for the deed, according to the humour in which Nemesis happened to be at the moment. The sacred rites of Sparta were restored to their wonted efficacy; and here one might have supposed the matter to have ended. Not so, however; for then follows what Herodotus pronounces to be the most divine and miraculous, but which will appear to the reader of the present day the most preposterous part of the story; as it probably did also to the more intelligent persons of the historian's own age who were free from this particular monomania. The divine wrath, he assures us, broke out again exactly fifty-five years afterwards, during the Peloponnesian war; wreaking itself on the descendants of the same Sperthias and Bulis by whose patriotic devotion the goddess had during half a century been appeased.

Nicolas son of Sperthias, and Aneristus son of Bulis, having been sent, together with one Aristeas a Corinthian, on a political mission by the Lacedæmonians, were seized, he tells us, by Sitalces king of Thrace, and delivered up to the Athenians by whom all three were killed. It is not easy, certainly, to understand, upon what principle of retributive justice the murder of these three persons by the Athenians could form an expiation of the murder of a Persian herald by the Spartans sixty years before; which latter murder had already been expiated to the satisfaction of the gods of those days by the fathers of two of the victims of Athenian vindictiveness. The crime of the Corinthian, which caused him to be involved in the same Nemesis, is not stated. But Thucydides[1] gives a clearer account of the transaction, and of the human Nemesis which was its real motive. He describes the envoys so seized and slain as six in number; three Lacedæmonians, an Argive, an Arcadian, and a Corinthian; and their death as an act of retaliation for previous outrages of the same kind committed by the Peloponnesians. It is evident that where there were two accounts of this affair, one describing Nicolas and Aneristus as two out of six, or but one third of the mission, the other as two out of three, the temptation to prefer the latter number would be as strong as it has proved with the historian, from the broader shadow of plausibility which it gave to his own case of retributive vengeance. That he should not, even in his own version, have overlooked the single Corinthian, greatly as his presence interfered with the moral symmetry of the tale, is also proof, that although

[1] II. 67.

he might be influenced by his prejudices in the choice of his data he was too honest to falsify them.

Xerxes and Artabanus.

His theory of divine retribution is also occasionally brought into very strange collision with his other two doctrines of predestination and prophetic warning. The grandest illustration which his book affords of his favourite idea of the jealousy of the gods against the attempts of mortals to arrogate their power, is his narrative of the expedition of Xerxes, of its humiliating failure, of the destruction of the despot's countless myriads of warriors, and of his own miserable flight from the scene of his discomfiture. Herodotus is here at no such pains as in the case of Crœsus or Cambyses to define the precise relation of cause and effect between the provocation and the Nemesis. Any such formal commentary on events of so great and fatal celebrity would have tended to weaken rather than enforce the lesson which they supply. That lesson is far more effectually inculcated in an indirect manner by the proceedings in the royal council of war, where the king's uncle and faithful adviser Artabanus attempts to dissuade him from his project. The address of Artabanus[1], while little else than a commentary on the subsequent series of disasters, also embodies more eloquently than any other passage of Herodotus his theory as to the origin of such catastrophes. "Observe," says the sage monitor to the vainglorious monarch, "how God chiefly aims his thunders at animals of lofty stature or great bulk, while for those of humbler size he careth not; and how his bolts fall on the stateliest palaces and the tallest trees; for he loves to cut over and keep down

[1] VII. 10. sqq.

whatever presumes to exalt itself. And thus the proudest host of warriors may be destroyed to its shame and confusion by one of trifling array, should God either strike them with a panic or overwhelm them with his war of elements. For he suffereth none but himself to conceive mighty thoughts." But in the immediate sequel the effect of this sublime admonition is dissipated by a series of dreams and other supernatural influences brought to bear on the mind of Xerxes; and which form perhaps the most unfortunate example of divine interposition to be found in the historian's page. Not only do they, by their frivolity, place both the Persian monarch, his Mentor, and his historian in a very ludicrous light; they also entirely exonerate the former from the charge of presumption in his future undertakings, and throw the whole responsibility of them, and of the human misery which they involve, on the same Deity who had just been represented as discountenancing and avenging such acts in his frail creatures.

His love of the marvellous.

7. The peculiar feature of the historian's character which we have here ventured to designate his credulity, has hitherto been examined solely in connexion with his religious views; with his impressions, that is, of the miraculous as resulting from the special interposition of the Deity. It remains to consider the same feature as exemplified in his descriptions of the marvellous in the existing phenomena of nature. It will here be proper, in the first place to notice another of the popular apologies for this defect of his genius.

Herodotus frequently[1] warns his readers that, while

[1] II. 123., I. 183., IV. 195., VII. 152., and alibi passim.

he considers it his duty to record the more important facts or events which have been communicated to him, he must not be understood in every case to vouch for the credit of his authorities or the accuracy of their statements. After this candid declaration we should, it has been urged, be doing him special injustice, were we to make him responsible for those portions of his narrative which, as being in their very nature least worthy of credit, we are the more bound to include in the category of those which he neither calls on us to accept as true, nor probably himself believed.

This apology is more specious than valid. For Herodotus, it will be observed, does not introduce these cautionary announcements solely, or even chiefly, in connexion with the marvellous, and as they appear to us incredible parts of his narrative. He is at pains to inform us that they apply to every portion of it which he has not himself had the means of authenticating, either by personal observation or other conclusive evidence. Their object is evidently but to remind the reader from time to time of the fact, a full consciousness of which he justly considers essential to a right estimate of his labours, that a great part of his information is derived from hearsay or popular tradition; and that in such cases he must only be held responsible for having, to the best of his judgement, selected from the variety of conflicting accounts such as appeared to him the most probable or the best supported. It were an obvious fallacy therefore, to insist on any peculiar application of those cautionary remarks to portions of his narrative which may appear to us improbable or incredible, but which, in the absence of any special caveat

in their individual case, we have no proof appeared so to himself.

Miraculous Persian skull.

For example: After his account of the battle of Platæa, and his description of the treasures found in the Persian camp, he goes on to say[1], that for many years afterwards the Platæans were accustomed to make in the neighbourhood of their city rich discoveries of gold and other valuables; and that when collecting the bones of the slain Persians into one grave, they found among other curiosities a head, the skull, jaws, gums, and teeth of which were of a single solid piece of bone. The whole of this information is given in one continuous paragraph, unqualified by either remark or comment in favour of or against any portion of it. And assuredly we have as little right to assume that Herodotus disbelieved the fact which he so distinctly states of the finding of the miraculous skull, as the facts of the collection of the bones, the discoveries of treasure, or even the battle of Platæa itself, of which all the other occurrences were a consequence.

But apart from this, the proposed mode of interpretation would involve the historian's credit in a degree even more serious than the charge of credulity from which it proposes to exonerate him. It could only relieve him from that charge at the expense of his honesty or of his common sense, or of both. It would assume that he had knowingly accumulated fictions in his text without any intimation that they were fictions, either with the deliberate intention of deceiving his readers, or with a knowledge that the fictions were in themselves so palpable that there

[1] IX. 83.

was no chance of any intelligent person mistaking them for truths.

Consistently, therefore, with all due latitude in the interpretation of those cautionary passages, the critical reader is entitled, or even bound in justice to his author to assume, whenever a statement is made by him without any special intimation of doubt of its accuracy, that although he may not make himself responsible for its full authenticity, he at least considered it as the best-accredited account of the matter; and in so far that he both believed it himself and intended it to be believed by others. That this rule is applicable to the marvellous as well as the probable portions of his narrative is further evident from the circumstance, that in the one as in the other case he frequently, after a series of statements delivered without comment, interposes in regard to some other statement his assurance that although he thinks it right to repeat it he does not himself believe it. On the logical principle that the exception implies the rule, the natural conclusion must here be that the remainder of the story to which no objection had been taken is offered to us as true.

Bald men and goat-footed men.

For example: Herodotus tell us[1] that in the extreme north of Europe was a race of men bald by nature from their birth, both male and female; which deficiency of head covering was made up in the men by unusually long and bushy beards. He adds that it was reported by these bald men, that in their neighbourhood was another people with goats' feet; but that this he did not believe.[2] There can be no doubt that the historian's knowledge both of

[1] IV. 23.

[2] IV. 25.

the bald men and of the goat-footed men was derived from hearsay; and we have, a priori, no right, in the face of his cautionary announcements above noticed, to consider him as vouching for the real existence of either the one or the other race. But the specific assertion that he did not believe in the existence of the goat-footed men, is a strong point of internal evidence, among others[1], that he did believe in the existence of the bald men.[2]

His theory of the marvellous.

In regard to the marvellous, as in regard to the supernatural, Herodotus has his own theory. Greece as might be expected is the region the physical features of which form the standard of the ordinary course of nature. Beyond the limits of that country wonders become more or less common; and increase in magnitude, if not perhaps in number, in different countries, in proportion to the remoteness of each from the Hellenic zero or minimum point of singularity. Lydia, for example[3], a country in the immediate neighbourhood of Greece, and peopled in part by Greeks, is said to contain few wonders. Egypt contains more than any other country.[4] The wonders however of both these regions, the few of Lydia and the many of Egypt, scarcely belong to the same category as those to which our notice is here particularly directed; being for the most part either natural phenomena, or works of art remarkable for size or splendour. Both countries being habitually accessible to the Greeks, and having been fully examined by Herodotus himself, could supply comparatively few additions to his stock of purely fic-

[1] In the previous § 16. he describes the body of information of which this notice forms part, as the most trustworthy he had been able to collect concerning these northern regions.

[2] Conf. II. 73. 121.(5), V. 86. [3] I. 93. [4] II. 35. sqq.

titious marvels. His personal observation enabled him, in most cases, to detect the falsehood of those which the native authorities endeavoured to impose on him; and his sterling good faith was a guarantee against any attempt on his own part to impose upon others.

Extremities of the earth.

8. It is in treating of the distant or unexplored parts of the world that this propensity to believe and report the incredible or impossible chiefly displays itself. The countries which supply the most copious materials for its indulgence are India, Arabia, the Hyperborean regions beyond Scythia, Ethiopia, and Libya. The first four of these regions are among those characterised by Herodotus[1] as "Eschatiæ," or Extremities of the earth; which extremities are distinguished, not only for the most wonderful phenomena, but for the noblest productions of nature. Among those productions gold is that on which he especially dwells. The gold of India is described[2] as guarded by a race of ants larger than foxes and swift as camels. He relates at some detail, evidently as a fact which he believed, the mode in which the Persian gold-merchants procure their supplies, and evade the fierceness and swiftness of the ants. The greatest summer heat in this Indian Extremity[3] is for some hours after sunrise; and during that part of the day the people are said to live up to their necks in water. Towards noon the air begins to cool, and at sunset becomes very cold, but warms up again during the night for the approaching daybreak. In the Ethiopian Extremity[4] gold is the commonest metal, and employed for the same base purposes, such as fetters for convicts and the like, to which iron

Gold regions. Indian marvels.

Ethiopia.

[1] IV. 106. sq. 116. [2] III. 102. [3] III. 104. [4] III. 20. sqq.

and brass are applied in other countries. The inhabitants of this Extremity are also the tallest, the handsomest, and the longest-lived race of men in the world, their ordinary age being 120 years. But the most copious supplies of gold are procured in the Hyperborean Extremity, in what mode the historian had not ascertained. The treasure was commonly reported to be guarded[1] by griffins, from whom it was plundered by the Arimaspians, a race of one-eyed men. In the reality of this race, or at least of their Cyclopian peculiarity, the historian asserts his disbelief. The bald men and the goat-footed men have already been noticed. The Neuri, another neighbouring tribe, had lately been driven out of their own territory by an invasion of serpents. Both the Scythians, and the Hellenic colonists on their coast, solemnly asserted to Herodotus upon oath[2] that each man of this tribe once a year became a wolf for two or three days; but here again he interposes his declaration of incredulity. Hyperboreans.

In Scythia proper, the only marvel of any importance, and which Herodotus describes[3] as very worthy of admiration, was a footmark of Hercules imprinted on a rock, and two cubits in length. This appears to have been the historian's conventional measure of heroic feet; the sandal of Perseus preserved at Chemmis in Egypt being also described as two cubits long.

The rare productions of the Arabian Extremity were chiefly its world-renowned spices. Ladanum[4] grew on the beards of goats; an example, as the historian observes, of the most stinking soil producing the sweetest crop. The trees on which frankincense Arabia.

[1] III. 116., IV. 13. 27. [2] IV. 105. [3] IV. 82. [4] III. 107.

grew were defended by flights of winged serpents. These animals once a year invaded Egypt[1]; on the frontier of which country they were met and defeated by an opposing army of Egyptian storks, at a certain mountain defile where they endeavoured to force a passage. Herodotus had seen the bones of the slain serpents lying in heaps on the scene of action, but had never seen the animal alive.[2] In order to prevent an undue increase of this pernicious race nature had made the following provision. At the pairing time every female, after her conception, destroyed the male; and she herself invariably died of the effects of her first parturition. This fact the historian further illustrates by the similar provision made to check the propagation of other destructive animals, such as the lion. The female of that species produced, he tells us[3], but one cub during her lifetime, her organs of conception being destroyed by this single parturition. Herodotus does not perceive that in this way the race of lions must have become extinct within a few years after its creation; since for every lion that was born two must have died in the ordinary course of nature, without allowance for casualties. Casia grew in a deep lake, and was defended by winged animals like bats; of equal ferocity with the guardians of the incense, and screaming terribly. Against these enemies the men protected themselves by wrapping their heads and bodies in thick leather hides, and so wading or swimming into the lake gathered the casia.[4] Cinnamon was procured from the nests of certain large birds, built on inaccessible cliffs with stalks of the cinnamon tree,

[1] II. 75. [2] III. 108. [3] III. loc. cit. [4] III. 110.

brought by the birds from some remote country unknown. The stratagem by which the cinnamon-merchants spoiled the birds of this treasure[1], was similar to that which another company of merchants, described by Sinbad the sailor, afterwards employed to obtain the treasures of the Valley of diamonds, from the same or a kindred race of birds called Rocs. They scattered in the neighbourhood raw limbs of cattle. These were carried by the birds up to their nests, which unable to bear the weight rolled over upon the plain, and the precious fragments were picked up by the men below. Arabia also produced two singular breeds of sheep, one with tails a foot and a half broad; the other with tails four feet and a half long. The tail of each animal of the latter breed, to prevent injury by dragging on the rough ground, was provided by the shepherds with a wheeled go-cart, on which the sheep drew it behind him in safety from place to place.[2]

Libya.

Of the Libyan marvels, the most remarkable were a race of men with no names[3]; a race of asses that never drank[4]; and a race of oxen with horns so long and projecting forward in such a manner, that their owners were obliged to feed walking backwards.[5] Herodotus was also informed[6] that in this region were men with the heads of dogs, and men without heads and with eyes in their breasts; but in the existence of these races he expresses his disbelief.

Eccentricities of manners.

Little less surprising than these natural phenomena, are the eccentricities of manners attributed to remote or barbarous tribes. In Pæonia, a country situated to the north-west of Thrace, is described[7] a race of men

[1] III. 111. [2] III. 113. [3] IV. 184. [4] IV. 192.
[5] IV. 183. [6] IV. 191. [7] V. 16.

living with their families, horses, and cattle, in huts raised upon scaffoldings in the middle of a lake, and approached by a long wooden bridge. The horses were fed on fish, which were so numerous in the lake that each proprietor, when in want of fodder, had but to let down a bucket into the water, through a hole in the floor of the hut made for the purpose, and draw up an abundant supply. Some wonderful customs are found prevalent in widely separate regions, under the same or slightly modified forms; and the accounts of them, recurring from time to time, are so similar both in substance and expression, as to amount to a sort of common-place in the author's narrative. The Massagetæ[1], a tribe to the north of the Caspian sea, sacrifice and eat their old people when they become feeble or diseased. The Indians[2] treat their sick in the same manner. The Issedonians, a Tartar race[3], also eat their parents, allowing them however first to die a natural death, when the whole kindred assemble in festive rite, and banquet on their flesh. Among the Massagetæ each man marries a wife, but all cohabit freely with the wives of each other. So also among the Nasamones of Libya.[4] In the Indian gold country the men and women cohabit openly. So also in the region of Caucasus[5], and among the Libyan tribes.[6]

Impositions practised on Herodotus.

9. It would hardly fail to happen that a man who believed such stories, or thought them worth diligently noting in his tablets as materials for a great

[1] I. 216. [2] III. 99. [3] IV. 26. [4] I. 216., IV. 172.

[5] III. 101., I. 203., μίξις ἐμφανής, κατάπερ τοῖσι προβάτοισι: conf. I. 93., V. 6.

[6] Especially among the Machlyes (IV. 180.), whose name according to its Greek etymology (μάχλος, lascivus, mœchus) denotes the freedom of manners here in question. Conf. IV. 172. 176.

historical work, would become the butt of humorous or malicious persons to whom he might apply for intelligence in the course of his travels. That such was the case with Herodotus, he himself assures us. The only information which he had been able to procure from any native Egyptian topographer relative to the source of the Nile was, he tells us, derived from the sacred scribe of Minerva at Saïs; and he adds[1] that his informant, although he asserted in the most positive manner the correctness of his statement, appeared to him to be joking. According to this reverend trifler, "there were situated between Syene and Elephantine two peaked mountains, the one called Crophi, the other Mophi. From a bottomless abyss at their base issued the stream; one half of which ran north through Egypt, the other south into Ethiopia." There is an obvious analogy between these names Crophi and Mophi, and those of Gog and Magog, which in our own nursery mythology denote twin mountains as well as twin heroes. Although Herodotus perceived, as he himself informs us, that the priest was joking, and although he had also clear personal proof of the falsehood of the story, having himself explored the Nile up to Elephantine, yet he does not hesitate to follow up the subject, by a subtle speculation on what might have been the real nature of the phenomenon narrated, supposing the story of the sacred scribe to have been true.

Upon another occasion Herodotus was shown a row of colossal female statues without hands. These figures, he was assured by the same priests of Saïs, represented the concubines of king Mycerinus, and

[1] II. 28.

had been fashioned without hands, because the queen of Mycerinus had caused the hands of the women when alive to be cut off, as a punishment for abetting her husband in an outrage upon one of his own daughters. Here again Herodotus possessed the means of detecting the trick; having observed, as he tells us[1], that the figures were originally executed with hands; which had fallen off, from the effects of time and dilapidation; the fragments of them being still visible at the base of the statues.

The translation, supplied to Herodotus, of the inscription on one of the larger pyramids, represented it[2] as "recording the quantity of onions, leeks, and radishes, consumed by the labourers employed in the erection of the monument." Were a foreigner, ignorant of the English tongue, to ask the meaning of the inscription on the London monument, of some humourist of Fish-street hill, the answer might probably be, that it recorded the number of quarts of porter and pipes of tobacco consumed by the builders of the column; but it is not likely that he would put faith in the statement. Herodotus however seems, in the parallel case, to have believed his informants implicitly; having no such tangible proof of their mendacity as in their previous accounts of Crophi and Mophi, and the mutilated statues; for he makes their statement the basis of his calculation of the entire cost of the pyramid.

The truth is, that if we except what Herodotus himself saw, or learnt from his fellow Greeks settled in the country, there is scarcely in his work a single piece of information concerning Egypt, its past

[1] II. 130. [2] II. 125.

history or actual condition, that can be relied on. Every communication specified as obtained by him from native historical sources is, in so far as we have means of judging from its internal evidence or from collateral data, either absolutely false; or if it can from other evidence be presumed to be founded on fact, is so disfigured by fables, as effectually to prove the systematic course of deception which the native organs of tradition were in the habit of practising upon strangers.

With these well-ascertained examples in the case of Egypt, we are justified in assuming, that in some other instances previously cited, the marvellous stories collected by Herodotus in different regions were invented by his local informants for the purpose of imposing on credulous visitors. The Hellenes, for example, of the Scythian coast, who were ready to make oath that every man of the tribe of Neuri annually became a wolf, were not probably better convinced of the truth of their story than Herodotus describes himself to have been. Similar no doubt was the case of the Persian gossips, who with more persuasive effect assured him that several of the colossal ants of the Indian gold country were preserved in the royal menagery at Susa.[1]

His excursive anecdotes and historical gossip.

10. It remains to consider the third peculiarity of the historian to which attention has above been directed as prejudicial to the credit of his narrative: his desire to enhance its effect by entertaining anecdotes, striking historical combinations, and other similar expedients.

[1] III. 102.

Herodotus has been charged by ingenious but unduly severe critics, with having written his work rather for the purpose of amusing his readers than with the higher objects of the historian. This charge appears to be an exaggeration of the defect here in question. There seems no reason to doubt that his primary object was to instruct his countrymen in the more important historical vicissitudes of their own nation and of the civilised world. There can however be as little doubt that, whether with a view of more effectually securing attention to his lessons, or with the less-disinterested object of extending his field of popularity, or from some inherent tendency of his mind to indulge in anecdotical details, his efforts to combine entertainment with instruction have in many instances produced results more consistent with the character of a writer of romance than a writer of history.

Without anticipating those illustrations of the general scheme of the historian's work which belong to a future chapter on its composition and style, it will here be proper to remark, that its principal subject, as defined by himself, is the origin and course of the wars waged between the Hellenes and the great oriental powers. As these wars, according to his own theory, were caused by a course of aggression on the part of the same oriental powers, especially of the Persian emperors, which reached its climax in the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, he naturally selected as his main line of narrative the rise and aggrandisement of the Medo-Persian dynasty. With this main subject were to be interwoven historical notices of the Greek or foreign states whose affairs were more intimately connected with those of Persia. A detailed

history of any one of those states formed no part of the author's plan. But his public, or at least the more intelligent portion of it, had a right to expect, that such episodical notices of them as he introduced, should be bestowed on the more important facts of their history, not on mere local traditions and gossiping stories. Certain it is however, that a large portion of the episodical matter of Herodotus is of this latter description. Even in his principal narrative, the anecdotical details often usurp the place of the main facts of history; and in many instances we owe our knowledge of those main facts but to incidental allusions occurring in the course of some comparatively insignificant digression.

Corinthian history and court scandal.

One of the most important chapters in the early history of Greece is, or rather would be did we possess it, that descriptive of the Corinthian state under the Cypselidæ; and more particularly under Periander, the second and last tyrant of that family. We know that Corinth during the reign of this prince was more powerful than she ever was afterwards, or probably had ever been before. We know that she ruled over extensive colonial territories, of her possession of which there is no trace after the death of Periander. We know that her colonial dominions were situated chiefly on the coasts and islands of Epirus; and especially that Periander was lord of the great and flourishing island of Corcyra. We know that Corinth in those days maintained the largest maritime force among the Greek states, and carried on an extensive commerce, which both enriched her citizens and supplied a large revenue to the state. These various facts we know on competent testimony. We know them however but as bare facts, and solely or chiefly from inci-

dental notices by writers treating of other subjects or of other periods of Corinthian history.[1] Of the mode in which the republic acquired, or in which she lost, this power and preeminence among the Greek states, we know nothing. The value of this missing chapter of Greek history is the more manifest from the details given in the first book of Thucydides.[2] The quarrels there described between Corinth and her colony Corcyra, the latter being then an independent and powerful republic, which quarrels were the immediate cause of the great Peloponnesian war, originated evidently in the previous relations between the two states; which, chiefly established by Periander, partly perhaps by his predecessor, subsisted during his reign and ceased at his death.

These remoter events of Corcyro-Corinthian history formed no part of the subject of Thucydides. His object was but to show how the recent disputes between the two states had led to the Peloponnesian war. Nor could blame have attached to Herodotus had he too merely overlooked this earlier portion of their history; neither state being among those whose position had brought them into special connexion with his main subject of Helleno-Persian politics; a fact which may be urged among other proofs of the decline of Corinth since the death of Periander. For the influence of that monarch was great even in Asia minor prior to the Persian supremacy.[3] If however Herodotus did think fit to devote any considerable share of his text to the affairs of Corinth, we had a right to expect that he would give a preference to

[1] Thucyd. I. 13. 24. sq.; Tim. frg. 53. Did.; Strab. VIII. pp. 378. sqq., conf. supra, Vol. III. p. 387.; Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. III. p. 57.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] I. 20., V. 92.(6) 95.

those possessing real historical importance. But instead of this, while a very liberal allowance of his text has been given to the history of Corinth, or rather of Periander, it has been allotted all but exclusively to popular and for the most part scandalous and fabulous anecdotes.[1] We are told how Periander supplied his ally Thrasybulus of Miletus with the interpretation of an oracle of Minerva Assesia; how by the allegory of the corn-stalks he instructed the same ally in the best mode of governing his Milesian state; and how he was appointed arbiter to settle the boundary line in dispute between Mitylene and Sigeum; how he entertained the poet Arion at his court, with that poet's marvellous maritime adventure; how he murdered his wife Melissa, and outraged her body after death; how he afterwards consulted her shade by the necromantic rite of the Molossian Acheron, was informed by her that her corpse felt cold; and how he collected the Corinthian ladies in the temple of Juno, stripped them of their holiday attire, and burnt their precious garments and jewels as a holocaust to warm and appease the shivering ghost of his murdered queen. We are further told, that like his contemporary Crœsus he had two sons, one of whom named Lycophron alone gave promise of proving a worthy successor to his father, the other being weak of intellect; that Lycophron, a youth of generous but morbid temperament, so resented the treatment, real or imputed, of his mother, as to refuse all intercourse with his father. A copious account ensues of the severe, though affectionate, but vain efforts of the father for a reconciliation, and of the

[1] I. 20. 23., V. 92. 95., III. 49. sqq.

refuge sought by the son, first with his grandfather Procles at Epidaurus, and, on the occupation by Periander of that city, at Corcyra. In the end Periander, in order to secure during his own lifetime the succession of his empire in his family, offers to cede to the youth the sovereignty of the city and state of Corinth, and content himself during his latter days with the government of Corcyra. The offer is accepted; but the Corcyreans, alarmed at the prospect of the tyrant's residence among them, frustrate the arrangement by killing Lycophron; and Periander in revenge sends three hundred noble Corcyrean youths as a present to Alyattes king of Lydia, to be converted by him into eunuchs for the service of his harem.

The only facts entitled to rank as history, which can be extracted from this copious mass of entertaining and well-told Corinthian court scandal, are: that Periander was lord of Corcyra and Epidaurus as well as Corinth; that he took Epidaurus from his father-in-law Procles; and that he was on friendly terms with the sovereigns of Asia minor. But concerning the rise and fall of the maritime power of Corinth, or the acquisition and loss of her colonial dependencies of Corcyra, Epidamnus, Leucadia, Ambracia, Anactorium, and Apollonia[1], we are left altogether in the dark.

Solon.

11. Another instance of this sacrifice of the substance to the shadow of history offers itself in the visit of Solon to Crœsus. If there was any subject of local Greek politics which had a strong claim on the special attention of Herodotus, from its influence on the future destinies of Greece and the civilised

[1] We are favoured, however, with a long chapter of the mythological gossip of this city in book ix. § 93. sq.

world, it was the legislation of Solon with its causes and results. But this important subject is scarcely noticed, while many pages have been devoted to a fabulous legend of the life of the legislator. The omission, however, here connects itself with a peculiarity common to the historical art of Herodotus with that of Thucydides and other leading Greek historians, — the all but exclusive limitation of his narrative, or at least of that portion of it which treated of his native annals, to the foreign politics of the different states; to their quarrels, alliances, military enterprises; or in so far as their internal affairs are noticed, to the parallel transactions between rival parties. The origin or growth of their laws and civil institutions, the distinctive features of their forms of government, matters which to the critical modern historian supply important heads of subject, are either overlooked, or afford occasion for but here and there a few incidental remarks. The study of Hume's history imparts about as competent a general knowledge of the growth and theory of the British constitution as a well-educated English gentleman is under any obligation to possess. But no such insight into the Spartan or Athenian constitution can be derived from any Greek historian of the best period. This branch of knowledge seems to have been considered the exclusive province of the professional writers on civil government, who began to abound in Greece in the latter days of Herodotus.

Sparto-Messenian wars.

Some little more attention has been bestowed by Herodotus[1] on the legislation of Lycurgus than on that of Solon. But the history of Sparta supplies perhaps the most pointed illustration of the anoma-

[1] I. 65. sqq.

lous mode in which he apportions his text among his heads of subject. By far the most remarkable events in the early annals of the Sparto-Dorian state are her long and obstinate wars against the rival republic of Messenia, terminating in the conquest of the latter and its annexation to the dominions of the victor. It was this conquest which established that ascendancy of Lacedæmon in the affairs of the Dorian section of the confederacy, which exercised so great an influence in the political destinies of the Hellenes. But throughout the history of Herodotus, no distinct mention is made either of the Messenian conquest or the events which led to it; and the few allusions that occur to Messenia at the epoch of the Persian war, are such as almost imply that country to have been still the seat of an independent commonwealth rather than a Spartan province.[1] With this indifference to the more important chapters of Lacedæmonian history, may be contrasted the large portion of the text bestowed on another series of transactions, also connected with Sparta, but of the smallest possible moment in their bearings on the destinies of that state or of any other part of the civilised world.

Cyrene. Among the Greek colonies there are few which act a less distinguished part in the national annals than the Spartan settlements of Cyrene and Barca. Maintaining scarcely any connexion with the mother country, they make but a sorry figure in the African political system, and on the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses offered themselves as willing vassals of the Persian empire. Yet to the history of these states Herodotus devotes a larger share of separate attention[2] than to

[1] v. 49., ix. 35—64.: but conf. i. 68., iii. 47.

[2] iv. 145. sq. There is a peculiarity in the real history of those states

that of any native Greek republic; probably because their legends, as abounding in marvellous incident, presented an unusually large amount of material for his favourite vein of anecdotical enlargement.[1]

Affairs of Samos.

He gives us indeed to understand, by precept as well as example, that his motive for dwelling on the concerns of a particular country was not always so much their historical importance, as the interest which, from special causes, he happened himself to take in them. The condition of Samos under Polycrates, shortly before the Græco-Persian wars, presented much analogy to that of Corinth under Periander; each commonwealth being subject to an able and enlightened usurper, under whose rule it had attained a high degree of power and prosperity. There was however this difference in the two cases, that while the affairs of Corinth stood in no immediate connexion with the historian's main line of narrative, those of Samos stood in the very closest. The island lay on the high road of Persian conquest,

which renders, in their case, the historian's practice of preferring the shadow to the substance of events the more to be regretted. The rapid advance of their sovereigns in wealth and power seems to have been greatly owing to the commerce carried on with the Silphium, a medicinal plant of indigenous and abundant growth in that part of Africa; and the sale of which appears to have been a royal monopoly. On a curious vase published by the Roman Archeol. Inst., Annali, tom. v. p. 56., king Arcesilaus is himself represented as weighing out this drug to his customers. Herodotus (IV. 169. 192.) several times mentions the plant, but without any notice of the trade. The drawing also contains in its details curious proof of the direct influence of the Egyptian mythology on that of these Libyan Greeks.

[1] Nor is it easy to understand why Herodotus, in omitting all notice of the great and momentous Messenian wars, should have dwelt in such detail on those of more recent date but trifling importance, between Sparta and Tegea (I. 66. sqq.), unless it be that the legends of supernatural incident connected with the latter, those relative to the bones of Orestes and the chains with which the disputed territory was measured, possessed a peculiar hold on the historian's imagination.

and was constantly, and in the end fatally, mixed up with the vicissitudes of Græco-oriental politics; with all propriety, therefore, a considerable share of the historian's text has been devoted to its special history. The more remarkable must it appear, that this should be the only case in which he has thought it necessary to apologise for what he seems to have considered an undue digression, but which to the modern reader will appear less in that light than a large proportion of his remaining narrative. The apology itself is singularly characteristic of his own sense of the intrinsic value of different parts of his subject: "I have dwelt," says he[1], "the longer on the affairs of the Samians, because those islanders possess three of the greatest works ever executed by Hellenic artists. The first is a tunnel of seven stadia in length and eight feet in diameter, excavated through a mountain nine hundred feet high, along which tunnel runs another excavation three feet wide, conveying water to the city. The second is the breakwater of their port, two stadia long and twenty fathoms deep; the third is the largest temple of all that I have ever happened to see. On these grounds it is that I have enlarged so much on the affairs of Samos."

His spirit of hyperbole.

12. Another mode in which this anxiety to impart effect to his narrative at the expense of its historical substance displays itself, might perhaps without undue severity be defined as a spirit of exaggeration. We shall here prefer describing it by a more indulgent phrase as a spirit of hyperbole. The influence of this spirit is observable chiefly in the more exciting parts of his subject; in the accounts of mighty

[1] III. 60.

enterprises, brilliant exploits, desperate acts of daring, and the like. Here, again, it would be harsh to impute to Herodotus any intention of deceiving by wilful falsification of the data on which his descriptions are founded. All probably that can with justice be laid to his charge is his having preferred, among the varieties of tradition which in almost every such case were current, those best adapted to the purpose which, unconsciously perhaps, he had in view.

Expedition of Xerxes.

As a splendid exemplification of this tendency may be cited his account of the invasion of Greece by Xerxes. Even the more enthusiastic admirers of Herodotus have not hesitated to admit his estimate of the Persian forces to be extravagant. What he describes is not so much an invading army as a migration of races. The number of men whom Xerxes is made to transport, by land or by sea, into the heart of Hellas, is exactly 5,283,220.[1] Of these about one half were effective troops, soldiers or sailors; the other half were camp followers, or persons connected with the naval and military commissariat. To these however, he tells us, were to be added, an "incalculable" number of eunuchs and females; cooks, bakers, and concubines; besides horses, camels, other beasts of burthen, and the crews of the provision ships. The whole migratory mass may have amounted on this computation to about 6,000,000 of human beings. The fleet, between war galleys and provision ships, consisted of 4,200 vessels.[2] This entire armament marched or sailed from the Hellespont to the straits and coast of Thermopylæ in safety. Of

[1] VII. 186. sq.: conf. 184.

[2] VII. 184.

the land-force, amounting in all to four millions and a half, four millions crossed from Asia, the rest being levied in Europe. The passage of these four millions across the Hellespont, by a bridge of boats, occupied seven days and seven nights of unremitting march. What may have been the exact time required by the combined host, with its encumbrances, for traversing each of the precipitous mountain passes which it had to encounter between the Hellespont and Thermopylæ, we are not informed. The whole legend is one evidently adapted to the region of central Asia rather than of Greece or Europe. There is no reason to doubt that the great oriental despots may occasionally have moved against each other, on the wide expanse of plain over which their dominions extended, and with the vast resources which those wealthy countries supplied, military bodies on a scale in some degree similar, never certainly equal, to that here described. But the practicability of transporting across the rugged mountain regions of Thrace, Macedonia, and Hellas, a section of the male population of Asia greatly superior in number to that of the country which it proposed to conquer, might safely be denied, even were authorities agreed on the subject. They disagree however widely, and in such a manner as to prove the estimate of Herodotus to be but a selection from among other equally arbitrary data. One of the stelæ set up by the Amphictyons on the battle field of Thermopylæ, celebrated the small band of Greek warriors who fell in that combat as having fought against three millions of enemies. We have seen that the number of fighting men at which Herodotus rates the whole Persian land force was little more than two millions. The Amphictyons there-

fore, taking their inscription by the letter, adopted a computation greatly in excess of that of Herodotus. If on the other hand we assume their "three millions" to have denoted the whole land armament inclusive of camp followers, Herodotus would be a million and a half in excess of the Amphictyons. That a million or two more or less was a matter of little moment in the gross reckoning, appears further from the estimate of Ctesias[1], who may here as usual be understood to give the Persian account, and who differs widely both from the Amphictyons and from Herodotus. According to him the whole force with which Xerxes invaded Greece amounted to 800,000 men, and 1000 ships of war. Assuming these 800,000 to be the fighting men alone, the whole land armament would, adopting the Herodotean rate of camp followers, be about a million and a half. The army under the command of Mardonius at Platæa was, according to the same authority, 120,000 men, instead of 300,000 as in Herodotus. In the battle of Salamis on the other hand, the ships of the Greek fleet were 700, instead of the 380 of Herodotus. Taking these numbers as the Persian computation, there is yet no ground to impute partiality to Ctesias in favour of his Persian patrons. For he makes the Greek force by which Mardonius was defeated at Platæa still smaller in proportion to the enemy than does Herodotus; and describes the battle of Thermopylæ much according to the popular Greek account.

But apart from specific facts and numbers, the whole tenor of this portion of the historian's nar-

[1] Frg. 29. p. 50. Didot.

rative is in such a continued strain of hyperbole, as clearly shows how greatly the imagination was in the ascendant of the judgement in its composition. Darius is said, at the epoch of his death, to have been already engaged three years in making preparations for this enterprise[1]; and Xerxes took other four years to complete the interrupted measures of his predecessor.[2] A principal object of the historian's solicitude is an accurate note of the names of the rivers that were drunk dry by the troops on their march, with honourable mention of those the waters of which were copious enough to supply the necessities of the host without an entire exhaustion of their streams.[3] One Thracian lake of nearly four miles in circumference[4] is stated to have been drunk up by the beasts of burthen alone! The numbers of the force are taken, not by ordinary computation, but by measurement. A large body of men is packed closely within an enclosure surrounded by a stone wall, is there counted and marched out. The enclosure is then filled and emptied in the same manner over and over again, each successive replenishment being rated at the same round number as the first, without the necessity of further arithmetical process. Even poetical agency is called in to add to the general effect. The army on its march through Thrace is assailed by lions[5]; an animal never assuredly indigenous in that region; and the creatures alluded to, if not altogether fictitious, may safely be classed as some species of mountain lynx or wild cat, which the legend had magnified into lions for the occasion.

[1] VII. 1. [2] VII. 20. [3] VII. 43. 58. 196. alibi.
[4] VII. 109. [5] VII. 125.

No less imaginary than these Thracian lions are the ferocious sea monsters described by the historian as abounding in the waters around mount Athos, and as having devoured numbers of the mariners of the fleet of Mardonius shattered by a storm some years before in attempting to double that headland; the remembrance of which calamities induced Xerxes to cut his canal through the isthmus connecting Athos with the continent.[1] This is a source of maritime disaster unknown either before or since in the Greek seas, and to which even Homer, among the manifold dangers to which he exposes his shipwrecked mariners in the remoter realms of the Mediterranean, has scarcely ventured to give prominence.

His self-contradictions.

13. The indulgence in this spirit of hyperbole is productive at times of very curious anomalies; the assertions hazarded in one place for the purpose of giving effect to particular descriptions, being in direct contradiction to statements made in other passages where the author was writing under a different kind of influence. Of the battle of Marathon it is said[2], that "the Athenians were the first Hellenic warriors who had ever yet dared to meet face to face an adversary wearing the dress of a Mede; for until this time the very name of a Mede was a terror to the Greeks." The historian's object is here to place the valour of those by whom this brilliant victory was achieved in the most striking point of view; and in

Battle of Marathon.

[1] VI. 44 Mr. Grote has here made a charitable but not very successful attempt to save the credit of Herodotus, by assuming the phrase θηριωδεστάτης θαλάσσης to refer to the wild beasts of the Thracian forests; an interpretation which will hardly find favour with the more critical portion of the historian's commentators. Hist. of Greece, vol. IV. p. 422.

[2] VI. 112.

his anxiety to attain his object he asserts what is falsified by some four or five other previous passages of his narrative. In Book I. §. 165. he tells us that the Phocæans, when forced by the irresistible tide of Persian invasion under Harpagus to abandon their city, take to their ships, and seek for new settlements on the western shores of the Mediterranean, had, before finally setting out on their voyage, relanded in their port, and attacked and slain the whole Persian garrison left in occupation of the city by the invading general. In the sequel we are informed[1] that the great body of the Ionians fought gallantly against the overwhelming forces of the same Harpagus. During the revolt of Aristagoras against Darius, the Milesians are described[2] as bearing the brunt of a severe battle fought in conjunction with the Carians against the Persians; and in the ensuing account of the quelling of that revolt by the defeat of Histiæus, it is said[3] that the Hellenes made head against the enemy during a long day's action, until overpowered by a fresh body of cavalry brought up to reinforce their opponents. In the face of all these previous descriptions, the historian now gravely tells us that the Athenians at Marathon were the first Greeks who ever ventured to look a Persian warrior in the face! What, it must be hoped, he here meant to say was, that the Athenians were the first Greeks who in pitched battle had ever fairly beaten an army of Medes. But the whole value of his eulogy is lost under the load of hyperbolical glorification with which he has smothered it.

[1] I. 169.

[2] V. 120.; compare also § 49., where Aristagoras is made to describe the Persians as inferior, both in valour and in the art of war, to the Hellenes.

[3] VI. 29.

Greek nautical ignorance.

After the battle of Salamis, a deputation from the Asiatic colonies solicited the aid of the victorious Greek fleet then stationed at Ægina, in their proposed attempt to emancipate themselves from the Persian yoke. For the present, however, the commanders of the fleet are described as declining to proceed further than Delos; among other reasons because of their ignorance of the maritime region to the east of that island; the coast of Asia minor and the isle of Samos in particular, where their services were first required, "appearing to them as distant as the Pillars of Hercules."[1] This is one of the strangest statements of its kind to be found in the work of Herodotus; and its falsehood is evinced by the whole tenor and spirit of the history of Greek navigation as written by himself. The Ægæan sea, of which Samos was one of the principal ports, was not only a narrow sea, studded with islands and abounding in excellent harbours, but was in all respects a Greek sea, its shores occupied almost exclusively by Greek maritime communities, and is described by Herodotus himself as having been navigated freely for centuries by the ships and fleets of both mother country and colonies.[2] His

[1] VIII. 132. Οὔτε τῶν χώρων ἐοῦσι ἐμπείροισι . . . . . τὴν δὲ Σάμον ἐπιστέατο ζόῃ καὶ Ἡρακλέας στήλας ἴσον ἀπέχειν. Mr. Grote, as a consistent disciple of a German school of critics, one of whose fundamental doctrines is that no standard Greek author can ever contradict himself (see supra, Vol. I. Append. p. 516.), has here again endeavoured to save the credit of Herodotus, by assuming him to mean that the Greeks were prevented from proceeding further solely by an apprehension that a superior force might have been collected by the Persians on the coast of Asia for the defence of their own maritime frontier. The historian alludes no doubt in the previous context to this apprehension as an element of the disinclination of his countrymen to sail further eastwards. But the reasonableness of the one motive can neither supersede nor justify the absurdity of the other.

[2] I. 70. 152., III. 39. 44. 48. 54. alibi.

object is here, by an imaginary effect of contrast, to place in a more striking light the rapid increase, during his own time, of nautical power and enterprise among his European fellow-countrymen, of which result the victories he had just celebrated were a principal cause. And in his zeal to produce this illusive effect he would have us believe, that prior to the epoch of those victories the great central port of Samos, which was probably even in those days little less familiar to Attic merchants and seamen than the port of Piræus, was viewed by the Greek commanders stationed at Delos, within sight of this very Samos, much in the light of some terra incognita or ultima Thule of the eastern waters.

Persian ignorance of Greece.

When the Spartan envoy announced to Cyrus, after his conquest of Asia minor, that the Lacedæmonians would resent any act of aggression against the states of continental Greece, the historian makes the Persian monarch reply by turning to one of his Hellenic attendants and asking "who the Lacedæmonians were."[1] And, on being informed, he told the envoy that "he cared little for people who had open places in the middle of their towns, where they were in the habit of meeting and lying to each other upon oath." This anecdote may very possibly be true; and whether true or false is highly effective. It illustrates in a very happy manner the character of the semibarbarous conqueror, and the insignificance at this juncture, in his estimation, of those diminutive states, destined not many generations afterwards to subvert the proud fabric of empire which he was so busily engaged in erecting. But the reiterated introduction in the

[1] I. 153.

sequel, of the same figure of speech under other and inappropriate circumstances, not only destroys its value, but leads us to suspect that all the anecdotes in which it occurs are mere rhetorical inventions of the historian himself or the popular authorities from whom he borrowed.

When Atossa the sultana of Darius, in furtherance of her scheme for restoring her favourite Greek physician Democedes to his native country, urges her husband to undertake the conquest of Greece, she expresses her strong desire to provide her household "with Laconian, Argive, Athenian, and Corinthian waiting-maids."[1] Darius receives her proposal with complacency, and on her suggestion appoints a naval commission, under the guidance of Democedes, to visit the coasts of Hellas and report as to the present condition of its several states. Apart from other evidences, it might surely be inferred, from the reasons here assigned by Atossa for her interest in the proposed scheme of conquest, that the Persian court had by this time a tolerably clear notion of "who both the Lacedæmonians and the Athenians were;" and even had it been otherwise, the result of the commission could hardly have failed to supply the information required. Yet some time after the return of the commission, we find Artaphernes satrap of Ionia, brother to Darius and one of the ablest Persian statesmen of the day, on the introduction of the Attic envoys sent to treat of an alliance with Persia, asking, by an improvement of the question of Cyrus, "who the Athenians were, and what country they inhabited."[2] And again, at a still later period,

[1] III. 134. [2] V. 73.

Darius himself, when informed that the same Athenians had attacked and burnt to the ground his Lydian capital Sardis, is also made to inquire, with somewhat more vehemence but with equally unconscious simplicity, "who the Athenians were!"[1]

Egyptian eccentricities.

A favourite subject of enlargement in the historian's description of Egypt is the marked difference between its manners and customs and those of the other civilised regions with which he was acquainted, especially of Greece. Here again, the zeal with which he has exerted himself to impart interest to his picture of this singular country, has led him into broad general statements afterwards as broadly contradicted. "The Egyptians," he tells us[2], "among their eccentricities of religious custom, consecrate no women to the service of any deity either male or female; the rites of all, both gods and goddesses, being exclusively performed by men." Yet in the sequel he informs us[3] that the oracles of Ammon in Africa, and of Dodona in Hellas, were founded by two priestesses of the Theban Jove, kidnapped in Egypt by Phœnician adventurers, and sold as slaves, the one in Libya the other in Epirus. In another place he describes the practice of consecrating the female ministers of the same Egyptian god as similar to that which prevailed in the sanctuary of Belus at Babylon, and in that of Apollo Lycius at Patara.[4]

In one place he asserts[5] that "hero-worship was unknown among the Egyptians." He afterwards contradicts this statement by informing us[6]: "how Perseus son of Danaë had been honoured with a temple and religious rites by the inhabitants of

[1] v. 105. [2] ii. 35. [3] ii. 54.
[4] i. 182. [5] ii. 50. [6] ii. 91.

Chemmis in upper Egypt, in consideration of his ancestor Danaus, the colonist of Argos, having been a native of their city." He also describes[1] Helen, "daughter of Tyndareus," as similarly worshipped at Memphis under the title of the Foreign Venus; and adds that the same distinction had been conferred by the Egyptians on their own king Proteus, in whose reign that heroine visited the country, and whose sanctuary he was shown near that of Helen.[2]

Claim of Herodotus to rank as a critical historian.

14. One of the most important questions, in estimating the character of a historical writer, is the degree in which he possessed the critical faculty in dealing with obscure or controverted matters. The foregoing illustrations may seem to have anticipated the necessity of any special consideration of this question in the case of Herodotus. An author, the general course of whose narrative exhibits errors of statement or of judgement such as those above recapitulated, can hardly, it may seem, possess any strong claim to rank as a critical historian in the stricter sense. The greater part of those errors have, it is true, been cited in more immediate connexion with certain peculiarities of his temper or habits of thought, the effect of which was to supersede or deaden at times his natural powers of discernment, and which have hence above been characterised as the Anomaly of his genius. It might still therefore be supposed, that in those parts of his narrative which gave no similar scope to the same influences, there might be room for a better application of his discriminating powers. But with every desire to take the most indulgent view of his qualifications in this respect, we have

[1] II. 112.

[2] See Appendix J.

been able to discover in his mind but a small portion of that faculty which in the higher sense of the term can be called critical. In the same general way in which he has already been characterised as a man of sense and intelligence, he deserves also to rank as a man of inquiring mind. But he was not a man of a logical head. As with his facts and researches, so with his arguments and inferences. When treating of events and their causes as exhibited on the broad surface of the current of life, his conclusions are, generally speaking, as just and rational as they are honest and impartial. But the case is different with the details of his narrative or description. These, even apart from the secondary influences above referred to, will frequently be found, owing to mere oversight, carelessness, or habitual want of critical method, to be not only distorted from the semblance of historical truth, but at variance with the principal facts to which they are introduced as subsidiary.

There is here, as in so many other respects, a curious analogy between the genius of Herodotus and that of Homer. Both have been led, by their zeal for the interest of their narrative, into frequent self-contradictions. But there is this difference in the cases, that while a strict adherence to truth is with the historian a fundamental duty, with the poet it is quite a subordinate merit. When Homer, for example, after having in the opening scene of the Iliad described Apollo and Minerva, on the day of quarrel between the chiefs, as present in the Greek camp and busily engaged in controlling the destinies of the war, assures us in the immediate sequel, that on the day before the quarrel "all the gods" had gone to feast in Ethiopia, and had since been unable to attend to

the affairs of the Troad, the blunder, though palpable, is in no essential respect detrimental to the spirit of the poem. Few readers observe it, and to those who do, the only feeling it suggests is one of amusement at the lively eccentricity of the author. But when Herodotus, after having in numerous earlier passages described the unsuccessful valour with which the Asiatic Greeks had struggled in defence of their liberties against the overwhelming power of the Persians, gravely informs us that the Athenians who fought at Marathon were the first Greeks who had yet ventured so much as to look a Persian foe in the face, the self-contradiction is as offensive to our taste and reason as it is injurious to the credit of the work in which it occurs.

Our illustrations of this defect have, as already said, hitherto been limited to cases where the historian's critical judgement seems to have been obscured by certain feelings or prejudices peculiar to his own mind; in the examples here subjoined the anomaly seems traceable to mere oversight or confusion of ideas.

Scythian expedition of Darius.

One of the most elaborate portions of the historian's narrative is that which records the expedition of Darius into Scythia. The king, on crossing his bridge of boats over the Ister and entering the country of the enemy, leaves the Hellenic division of his army to guard the bridge, with orders to expect him back in sixty days. His return is described, accordingly, as having taken place a day or two after the lapse of the appointed period.[1] His operations however on the hostile territory, according to the

[1] iv. 98. 122. sqq. 133. sqq.

details afterwards given, must have occupied at least double that time; and upon a more strict estimate of the possibilities of the case, they could hardly have been accomplished within less than the triple or quadruple of it.

Estimate of distance by day's journeys.

Herodotus describes Scythia as a square country, the length of each side being twenty days' journey.[1] These day's journeys he rates at twenty-five miles each; giving 500 miles for each side of the square. But in another part of his work[2] he reckons nineteen miles as an ordinary day's journey along the high post-road from Sardis to Susa, through the most civilised part of the Persian empire. It is, therefore, not easy to understand how he could have supposed either traveller or soldier capable of accomplishing twenty-five miles a day among the trackless wastes and broad rivers of Scythia. Were we to assume twenty or even fifteen miles as the full average length competent, for any continuity, including halts and contingencies, to an army of 700,000 men, in an unexplored desert where every necessary of life and every material of transport required to be carried along with them, it would be a liberal allowance. Let us however concede the historian's full twenty-five miles a day to the Scythian army of Darius. The south side of the quadrangle, extending twenty days' march, or 500 miles, along the shores of the Black sea and Palus Mæotis to the river Tanaïs, was the part through

[1] iv. 101. This however is contradicted elsewhere. The south side, here described as extending twenty days' journey, ten from the Ister to the Borysthenes and ten from the Borysthenes to the Tanaïs, is made in § 18. sqq. at least thirty days' journey; the distance from the Borysthenes to the Tanaïs being there rated separately as full twenty days.

[2] v. 53.

which the king first directed his route in pursuit of the retiring Scythians. On the other bank of the Tanaïs, which bounded Scythia to the eastward, lay the Sauromatæ, whose country he makes[1] extend to a breadth of fifteen days' march beyond the river. On the other side of the Sauromatæ were the Budini, the extent of whose country is not stated; but as they are called[2] a "very large nation," with a city near fifteen miles in circumference, it might safely be assumed that their territory was as spacious as that of the Sauromatæ, who are made the subject of no such remark. Let us however take its breadth at but ten days' march. Beyond the Budini lay an entirely desert region. Darius, having pursued his fugitive foe across the Tanaïs and through the territories of the Sauromatæ and Budini, halts on the frontier of the desert[3], and occupies himself with the construction of eight forts or castles, at distances of seven miles from each other, forming consequently a line of fortified posts extending in all about fifty miles. Hearing however that the Scythians had made a retrograde movement towards their own country, he breaks up his cantonments, leaving his forts half-finished, and recommences the pursuit. The Scythians, on reentering their own territory, make another wheel to the northward, recross their frontier in that direction, and still pursued by the Persians traverse in succession the countries of four neighbouring northern nations, the Melanchlæni, Androphagi, Neuri, and Agathyrsi.[4] They then once more pass into their own country; when Darius, fatigued with his fruitless wandering, retreats, and

[1] iv. 21. [2] iv. 108. [3] iv. 124. [4] 125. sqq.

falling into the same line of march by which he had first advanced from the Ister towards the Tanaïs, returns to his bridge of boats on the former river.

Let us now see how the account of the number of days occupied by this expedition ought to stand, according to the above details supplied by the historian himself, as compared with his original sum total of sixty days.

From the Ister to the frontier of the Sauromatæ on the east side of the Tanaïs was a distance of twenty days' continuous march at twenty-five miles a day. In the course of this march the army had to cross some five or six rivers, two of which, the Borysthenes and the Tanaïs, are described as scarcely second in magnitude to the Ister, to secure the passage of which the king had sent a fleet from Ionia with materials for constructing a bridge. The impossibility, therefore, of his march of 500 miles in twenty days through this region becomes the more glaringly extravagant. Let us however take it as the historian represents it. Add the fifteen days' march across the territory of the Sauromatæ, and the ten for the country of the Budini, and we have in all forty-five days up to the king's halting-place on the frontier of the desert. We shall reckon the length of time occupied in distributing his army into cantonments extending fifty miles for the construction of his eight forts, with that consumed in the half-completion of the forts and in the remuster for the renewed pursuit of the enemy, at a week only, making (45 + 7) fifty-two days. Assuming his original march through the Sauromatian and Budinian territories to have been in an oblique rather than a direct line beyond the Tanaïs, and his return

consequently to have occupied but one half the time required for his advance, it would have taken thirteen days to bring him back to the Scythian frontier, which he would have reached (52+13) on the sixty-fifth day. His further wanderings in search of the fugitive host through the country of the four northern nations, Melanchlæni, Androphagi, Neuri, and Agathyrsi, assuming each of those countries to have been but five days' journey in breadth, would have lasted twenty days; and this without any allowance for the time occupied in crossing the north of Scythia to reach their frontier. We should thus have at least (65+20) eighty-five days. Finally, according to the historian's original computation, which made the breadth of Scythia from north to south, as from east to west, twenty days' journey, the army would have required that number of days to return by the most direct course from the northern frontier to the bridge of the Ister; making in all (85+20) a hundred and five days. But to this reckoning a good many more days must be added; it being stated by the historian that Darius did not return direct from north to south, but fell designedly by an oblique movement into the old line of march by which he had originally advanced to the Tanaïs. The details, therefore, of the historian's own computation give a number nearly double that of his original sum total of sixty days; and it must be apparent to every intelligent reader, that the actual possibilities of the case would have required the triple or quadruple of that sum total.[1]

[1] Rennel, Mitford, Kenrick, and other commentators, dwell much on the difficulty of reconciling these details with the real geography of Scythia. But the far more important point, as affecting the historical credit

Estimate of time by generations,

15. We have seen how vague is the historian's estimate of distances by day's journeys; that on the great imperial high road from Sardis to Susa he rates a day's march at 150 stadia, or less than 20 miles; while on the inhospitable deserts of Scythia he rates it at 200 stadia, or 25 miles. Similarly vague is his estimate of time by generations. In his Egyptian history he gives $33\frac{1}{3}$ years to a generation[1]; assigning to the 341 generations of kings there alluded to about 11,350 years. But in his account of the Heraclid kings of Lydia, he makes[2] the twenty-two generations from Agron to Candaules equal to but 505 years; or about 23 years to a generation. The generations of Spartan kings from Hercules to Leotychides, who flourished 230 years later than Candaules, are described[3] as but twenty in number; they extend therefore over 735 years, giving about 37 years to a generation, and making a generation of Spartans two fifths longer than a generation of Lydians. All this Herodotus does without explanatory comment; leaving us completely in the dark either as to the principle on which his calculations may be based, or the peculiarities of circumstance by which they may in different cases have been modified.

and by reigns of kings.

Allusion has already been made to his habit of identifying, in his chronology of royal dynasties, reigns of kings with generations of men. In his Egyptian history he makes 341 reigns correspond to exactly as many successions from father to son, and to exactly as many pontificates of priests. In his

of Herodotus, and to which we have here exclusively confined ourselves, the impossibility of reconciling him with himself, seems to have escaped their attention.

[1] II. 142. [2] I. 7. [3] VIII. 131.

Lydian history twenty-two generations reign in the same uninterrupted order. The impossibility of any such correspondence ought the more readily to have struck Herodotus, considering that in his notices of the individual sovereigns of those same dynasties, we find the order of descent habitually disturbed, according to the common law of nature, by collateral successions, usurpations, and other contingencies. But these anomalies are not confined to his computation of mythical genealogies; they extend also to his notices of recent historical events. The interview which he narrates between Solon and Crœsus involves, as we have seen, a chronological error of some thirty or forty years. By a similar error Pisistratus (the younger contemporary of Solon) is made coeval with, or even prior to, the poet Alcæus. Hence, by implication, Alcæus, Solon, Pisistratus, and Crœsus are all made coeval with each other; and that not as junior and elder contemporaries, but in their mature age and active life. Herodotus here appears as the organ of the tendency every where observable in popular annalists, to bring the great men of a given period into personal contact.

Want of a standard chronological era.

These chronological anomalies are more or less a consequence of what constitutes in itself a fundamental defect of the historian's work, the want of any general standard or era for the computation of dates. This is a defect for which it may seem perhaps that the author's age rather than himself is responsible; and which was first effectually remedied some generations after his time, by the adoption of the Olympic era of 776 B.C. as a basis of national chronology. Herodotus appears however to have been here behind the spirit of his age, even as com-

pared with previous or contemporaneous historians. Two of the more celebrated works of Hellanicus, his Carneonicæ and his Argive Priestesses, were chronological compilations; and the epochs of the Priestesses were made the framework on which a course of national history was adjusted. Similar steps in the same direction were made by Charon in his annals of Lacedæmonian magistrates, and by Hippias in his attempt, abortive though it proved, to arrange the chronology of the Olympionicæ.

Other numerical anomalies.

This habitual inaccuracy is as observable in the other numerical details of the historian's text as in his reckoning of time or distance. The Greek warriors described as sacrificing their lives at Thermopylæ are rated, in the first instance, at 300 Spartans and 700 Thespians, making a total of 1000 men. But in the sequel we find the dead bodies of these warriors stated as 4000 in number; first in the inscription copied[1] by Herodotus from the stela of the Amphictyons; and afterwards in a passage of his own narrative. On the stela the whole 4000 are also specified as Peloponnesians; although in his own previous enumeration, where they were limited to 1000, 700 or more than two thirds were called Bœotians of Thespia, and but 300 or less than one third Peloponnesians of Sparta. In the subsequent passage[2], where they are swelled to 4000, he alludes incidentally to a portion of the number as consisting of Helots; of whom not a word is said in any other place. Are we to suppose that at Thermopylæ, as at Platæa, each Spartiate was attended by seven light-armed soldiers of this inferior rank, who were also

Battle of Thermopylæ.

[1] VII. 228.

[2] VIII. 25.

detained by Leonidas to form part of his great human sacrifice? If so, why were these poor men denied their share of notice for their share in the glory of the exploit? Even the additional 2100 Helots would, however, make up a sum total of only 3100. But in truth the whole account of this celebrated combat, while evidently in great part, like that of the battle of Thyrea[1], pure fable, is involved in a confusion and self-contradiction which no subtlety of criticism or conjecture can clear up or reconcile.[2]

Invasion of Egypt by Cambyses.

16. The invasion of Egypt by Cambyses was an enterprise so obviously, it might almost be said necessarily, involved in the onward course of Persian aggression, that the most diligent investigator of historical causes need hardly have been at pains to trace it to any other motive than the ambition of that sovereign. An event, however, of this nature seldom failed to receive from Herodotus some more romantic colouring than it derived from the realities of international politics. Accordingly he tells us[3] that Cambyses was instigated to his attack on Egypt by resentment at the insult offered him by king Amasis, whose daughter he had asked in marriage. The Egyptian monarch, to whom the alliance was by no means agreeable, but who was unwilling to irritate his formidable neighbour, sends, in the assumed character of the princess, a daughter of the late sovereign Apries whom he had deposed. The fictitious princess, by name Nitetis, described as in the bloom of youth and beauty, is at no pains to conceal from Cambyses, whose affections she had secured by her personal charms, the trick that had been played on him, and which he determines to revenge by the conquest of Egypt.

[1] Supra, Ch. v. p. 328. [2] See Appendix K. [3] III. 1. sq.

According to the historian's Egyptian chronology, which is here sufficiently precise, this "fair young girl," as he calls her, would have been between forty and fifty years of age; Amasis, who died almost simultaneously with the invasion of his kingdom, being described as having reigned forty-four years; and Apries deposed by Amasis, as having been put to death shortly after his deposition.[1] So that, even assuming Nitetis to have been born to Apries during the short interval between his deposition and his death, she could hardly have been under forty-three.

This is one of the few instances where Herodotus has entered on a critical exposition of the reasons which induced him to select, among the several versions of a current legend, the one which he has preferred; but his argument is as much at fault as his chronology. The Egyptians, it seems, asserted that it was not to Cambyses but to his father Cyrus that Nitetis was sent by Amasis; nor does their account imply that the deceit had been discovered; and they even went the length of maintaining that Cambyses was her legitimate son by Cyrus. This version of the story Herodotus dismisses, on the ground that Cambyses was notoriously the son of another sultana of his father. Although this argument, admitting the fact on which it is based to be correct, is not worth much, it is probable that the particulars of the Egyptian account are as fabulous as those of the one preferred by the historian. But the substance of the Egyptian version, in so far as describing Cyrus rather than Cambyses as the person on whom the fraud was practised, is certainly more

[1] III. 10.: conf. II. 170. The latter passage implies that Herodotus dated the accession of Amasis from the death of Apries.

plausible. For while we should thus escape the chronological blunder of Herodotus, it was in itself more likely that Amasis would attempt such a fraud on the semibarbarous chief of a new monarchy, at an early period of his career, than after the mighty empire which he had created had been fully established under a permanent dynasty. The story was probably invented by the Egyptians, in their anxiety to save the national honour by investing Cambyses with the character of a native Egyptian sprung from one of their own most popular monarchs; just as the Median tradition of the birth of Cyrus, preferred by Herodotus, made that conqueror grandson of Astyages instead of an independent foreign usurper. The legend might afterwards, as usual, assume a variety of conflicting forms; among others that to which Herodotus assigns a prior claim to authenticity.

Walls of Babylon.

With these errors or exaggerations in the historian's reckoning of time, may be compared other similar extravagances in his measurement of bulk or space. Such are the 60 miles of circumference, 337 feet of height, and 75 feet of breadth, assigned to the walls of Babylon[1]; walls moreover consisting of two circuits of masonry, each, according to the tenor of the description, of nearly equal dimensions. The degree of credit which different readers may place in these accounts will

[1] I. 178. sq. The conventional number for the height of the walls in the Babylonian tradition, which is here adopted by both Herodotus and Ctesias, seems to have been 200 cubits. But the royal Persian cubit, Herodot. loc. cit., was longer than the common cubit. Herodotus adopts the former, which gives 337 English feet; Ctesias the latter, which gives but 300. The discrepancies in the accounts of the circuit of the walls are much greater than in those of the height; the excess being still largely on the side of Herodotus. Ctesias has 360 stadia (45 miles); Quintus Curtius, 368 stadia; Strabo, 385; Herodotus, 480. See Rennel, Geogr. of Herodot. p. 340.; Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. III. p. 396.

depend very much on their own individual capacities of belief in such cases. But we find it difficult even to conceive the existence of such a line of 60, or rather of 120 miles, of what a modern historian very appropriately designates "artificial mountains."[1] As Herodotus tells us that these fortifications had been destroyed by the Persians before his visit to the city, a disbelief in the accuracy of his statement involves no impeachment of his personal veracity.

Persian love of democracy.

17. We learn from the historian[2] that the more critical portion of his own public repudiated, and with good reason, the strange story which he himself believed and vindicated, of the deliberations held by the seven Persian chiefs after the death of the Magi concerning the best form of government, and of the orations pronounced by three of the chiefs, as advocates respectively of the monarchal, aristocratic, and democratic forms. In the sequel he describes how the Persian viceroy Mardonius, after the suppression of the Ionian revolt, abolished the tyrannies of the tributary Greek states, and established democracies in their stead[3]; and he remarks ironically, that this fact "will appear wonderful in the eyes of those who disbelieve his previous statement, that a proposal for converting the Persian empire into a democracy had been entertained by the Seven conspirators." Here the historian shows his want of the critical faculty in two ways; first in the implicit belief which he reposes in so palpable a fable as the account of that same Persian display of political rhetoric; secondly,

[1] See Appendix L.

[2] III. 80.

[3] VI. 43. This measure is said by Diodorus, Excerpt. Vat. ed. Maj. p. 38., to have been suggested (not to Mardonius but to Artaphernes) by the historian Hecatæus. See supra, Ch. iii. § 2.

in his blindness to the real spirit of a measure which places in a very broad light the sagacious and penetrating policy of Darius towards his Hellenic dependants. That monarch had just succeeded, with some difficulty and much bloodshed, in quelling a most determined insurrection of the Greek states, which also spread to the non-Hellenic provinces of Caria and Cyprus. The revolt had been conducted secretly by Histiæus tyrant of Miletus, openly by his brother Aristagoras who, in the absence of Histiæus detained at Susa as confidential companion of Darius, acted as viceroy of Miletus. It had been the early policy of the Persian emperors, to maintain in their usurped rights the tyrants whom they found on their conquest of Asia minor ruling the Greek commonwealths of that country; under a natural impression that it would be the personal interest of those petty chiefs to support the imperial government, and thus secure, under its vassalage, each his individual allotment of royal power. And to a certain extent this policy had been successful. It had however now become obvious, that restless ambition, and the innate spirit of Hellenic independence, were stronger in the breasts of these often enlightened and high-minded men, than mere desire to enjoy their despotic power under the humiliating tenure by which they held it. Histiæus, himself a special favourite of Darius, had been formerly suspected of a scheme to erect into an independent principality a territory bestowed on him by the king in one of the European provinces; and it was with a view to keep a better watch over his conduct that Darius had since retained him about his person. But this precaution had not prevented him from setting on foot the most formidable insurrection

by which the empire since its first establishment had been disturbed. With this experience of the little confidence to be reposed in his Hellenic vassal princes, what more natural than that such a sagacious politician as Darius should argue: "Will it not be wiser to try another system, and indulge these Ionians in their darling republican forms; the restoration of which was one of the chief inducements to revolt held out to them by Aristagoras? Shall we not, while conferring on them a gratifying boon, find it easier to deal with headless democracies than with cunning political chiefs? Shall we not thus obviate the risk of any individual citizen attaining that personal ascendancy the evil effects of which we have just experienced?" Such, and such alone, assuredly were the grounds of this change of policy, in which Herodotus was simple enough to discover a real partiality, in the mind of so uncompromising a despot as Darius, for those democratic forms which he introduces Otanes expounding in the council of Seven with all the subtlety of an accomplished Attic rhetor.

Geographical criticism of Herodotus.

18. As in his main capacity of historian, so in his subsidiary one of geographer, the merit of Herodotus is to be sought rather in his practical knowledge and guileless integrity than in his speculative opinions. He adopts the popular division of the earth into three principal parts, Europe, Asia, and Africa; but his notions of the relative size and position of those parts are but crudely digested.[1] Europe is made equal in extent to both the others, comprising as it does the whole northern region of modern Asia; the line of frontier being drawn due east from the shore of the

[1] iv. 42. sqq.

Black sea to the ocean. He no where gives us distinctly to understand what he believes to be the form of the earth; but he ridicules those who figured it as a circular plane with the river Ocean running round it.[1] He knew or believed Africa to be a peninsula, surrounded, to the south and west, by the same waters which bounded it to the east and north in the form of the Arabian gulf and the Mediterranean sea. He also believed this peninsula to have been circumnavigated by Phœnician mariners in the service of Pharaoh Neco. Several of the heads of hearsay information which to himself, as well as to later geographers of higher pretensions, appeared fabulous, have since been proved to be true. He tells us for example that those Phœnician navigators asserted, that during their voyage they saw the meridian sun to the right instead of the left, or in other words to the north instead of the south, of their course, but that he did not believe their report.[2] His incredulity is here the more curious, that in his own theory as to the cause of the rise of the Nile, to be noticed below, he describes[3] the sun as vertical in Libya at the winter solstice, and as occupying during the summer a position in the heavens far to the north of its southern solstitial point; in which case a man who sailed round the south extremity of Libya must necessarily, on the historian's own showing, have seen the luminary where the Phœnician voyagers saw it. He also describes the Caspian sea as surrounded by land.[4] This statement Strabo[5] attacks as erroneous, asserting the Caspian to be but a large gulf of the eastern ocean; a proof, among others, that in the time of Herodotus,

Circumnavigation of Africa.

Caspian sea.

[1] IV. 8. 36., II. 23. 45. [2] IV. 42. [3] II. 24. sqq.
[4] I. 203. [5] VII. p. 294.

during the united supremacy of the civilised Persian government, some points of distant Asiatic geography were better understood than in the Roman period, when the sway of those countries was divided, as now, among a number of semibarbarous potentates.

Changes of seasons.

Herodotus believed the varieties of climate to be produced, not so much by the greater or less distance of the sun from the different parts of the earth, as by the influence of the winds, which he considered as independent atmospheric agencies, controlling the motions of the sun itself.[1] Winter was caused by the cold gales that come down at that season from the north, and drive the sun southward out of its natural course, which it resumes in summer on the cessation of the hostile influence.[2] The rise of the Nile ought, according to the historian's theory, rather to be called the fall of the Nile. The normal state of the stream was with him its state of inundation; the diminution of its waters being attributed to their absorption in summer by the rays of the sun, when vertical over the sources of the river in Ethiopia.

Rise of the Nile.

Herodotus describes the countries visited by himself faithfully and often carefully. When dependent on the information of others his statements can the less be trusted, that while the honest simplicity of his own character disinclined him from assuming others to be false, his superstition and love of the marvellous led him easily to credit the popular fables current concerning little-explored regions. He shows great diligence in collecting statistical facts concerning the revenues and internal condition of the Persian empire[3]; as also regarding the manners and military

[1] II. 24. sqq. [2] Loc. cit. [3] III. 89., V. 49. sqq.

array of the fifty nations who followed the banners of Xerxes[1]; his account of which is[2], however, probably in great part fabulous. Any closer analysis of the "Geography of Herodotus" belongs rather to the history of geographical science than to that of Greek literature. Attention has here been directed to the few points in which he seems to have been either in advance of, or behind, the spirit of his age, or where his views are marked by originality or eccentricity. His numerous errors of detail[3], whether as regards place or distance, unless when involving self-contradictions or exaggerations, are more justly chargeable on his times than on himself, nor consequently do they here require to be specially noticed in illustration of his genius.

His philological criticism.

19. We have already seen that the philological attainments of Herodotus were limited to his own tongue; and he was not a man to affect a display of knowledge which he did not possess. He from time to time however gives explanations of foreign words, as communicated, it may be supposed, by native authorities or by Greek professional interpreters.[4] We have the means of ascertaining the value of but few of these explanations; as however in those few the historian is generally at fault, there is the less room for confidence in the remainder. In the following case the misapprehension is curious in itself,

[1] VII. 61. sqq.

[2] Supposed by Niebuhr (Lect. on Ant. History, vol. I. lect. XXXVI. p. 321.) to have been borrowed from the poem of Chœrilus. This opinion its author supports by an appeal to Näke's commentary on that poem and on the life of its author; somewhat strangely, Näke having maintained and proved (p. 24. sqq.) that Chœrilus was much junior to Herodotus. Conf. Smith, Biogr. Dict. I. p. 697.; and Dahlmann, Herodot. § 34. p. 175.

[3] See Dahlmann, Herodot. § 12. p. 61. alibi.

[4] I. 110. 131., II. 2., III. 8., IV. 27. 59. 155. 192., VI. 98. 119., VIII. 86.

and supplies another example of his habitual want of critical precision.

In describing a series of Egyptian statues representing a line of hereditary priesthood, Herodotus tells us[1], that according to his native guides "each of the persons represented was a Piromi, son of a Piromi; and that Piromi in Egyptian signified noble and excellent." The real signification of this term, as every Egyptian scholar knows, is, and was in the antient Egyptian tongue, simply "man;" and in the monumental inscriptions it was customary to append the hieroglyphic which expressed it, as a determinative sign, to the names of human personages of the male sex, the better to distinguish them from those of females or of deities. It is indeed evident from the historian's own context that this was the sense in which the priests themselves employed the word. Their statement above quoted was made in reference to the ostentatious vanity of Hecatæus, who, when visiting the temple of Ammon at Thebes, traced his own pedigree, through a line of ancestors figured in the monuments of that sanctuary, up to an Egyptian deity. Upon this Herodotus remarks: that the priests with whom he conversed in the same sanctuary, repudiated not only the vain pretensions of the Milesian traveller, but also his notion of the descent of human beings from deities under any circumstances; and in illustration of their own opposite doctrine, they showed Herodotus the row of sacerdotal images in question, to the number of 345; and "not one of the persons there portrayed was," they asserted, "a god of either greater or less rank; but every one of them was a man (Piromi) and son of a man." It is difficult to compre-

[1] II. 143.

hend how Herodotus, in thus accurately recapitulating so distinct a statement, made too in corroboration of his own opinion, should have so completely misunderstood the import of one of its most important terms, as to render it both unmeaning in itself and pointless in its bearings on his own argument.

The experiment by which Psammetichus is described[1] as having attempted to discover the most antient language, and with the success of which Herodotus seems to have been well satisfied, is puerile in the extreme. In one part of his work the historian pronounces the Pelasgian dialect an altogether barbarous or foreign tongue as compared with the Hellenic; in others he represents it as identical with the same Hellenic.[2] His assertion[3] that the Persian proper names all terminated in the letter S, is supported no doubt by his Greek transcripts of them; but not by the genuine remains of the antient Persian tongue. The care, and it may be presumed the ingenuity, with which so many of those names have been moulded, whether by himself or preceding authorities, into popular Greek forms, is very remarkable. In numerous cases they are completely hellenised, both in sound and etymology. Such are Harpagus, Zopyrus, Hyperanthes, Prexaspis, Astyages, Megabates, Tritantæchmes, &c.

His mythological criticism.

Full credit has above been given to Herodotus for the judicious manner in which he has limited his main narrative to more strictly historical ages. Yet when he does incidentally touch on points of speculative mythology, he shows no advance beyond Acusilaus or Hecatæus in the art of mythological criticism. He

[1] II. 2.

[2] I. 57.: conf. II. 50. sqq. See Vol. I. p. 51. sqq.

[3] I. 139.

makes Perseus, son of Danaë, the eponyme patriarch of the Persians; Medea of the Medes.[1] Lycius, son of Pandion king of Attica, is the ancestor of the Lycians.[2] The Assyrian and Lydian empires are both founded by descendants of the Greek Hercules; the Assyrian by Belus, son of Alcæus, son of Hercules; the Lydian by Agron, son of Belus.[3] These and other etymo-mythological chimæras of the same kind, are propounded, incidentally it is true, but with all due gravity as real matters of fact.

His impartiality.

20. The best ground on which Herodotus can claim to rank as a critical writer is his impartiality. This is a quality the possession of which by a historian implies not merely honesty of intention, but, especially where so many influences concurred to beguile the feelings or warp the understanding, clearness of head and calmness of judgement. The impartiality of Herodotus is therefore substantial evidence of his possession of the critical faculty, in so far at least as regards his estimate of the conduct and character of his warriors and statesmen. Among other proofs of his conscientious fulfilment of this important part of a historian's duty, appeal may be made to the attacks to which he has been subjected on account of his imputed breaches of it. For, paradoxical as it may seem, the most impartial writers have often been those most exposed to the charge of partisanship. Where equal justice is dealt to all in a narrative of events, it rarely happens that all are satisfied with the share allotted to them; and those who, in such cases, benefit least by the distribution,

[1] VII. 61, 62. 150. [2] I. 173., VII. 92. [3] I. 7.

have more temptation to complain of favouritism than where the narrator avowedly takes a side.

The charges of partiality against Herodotus have been of two kinds: national partiality towards his own countrymen in their relation to foreigners, and partiality towards individual members of the Hellenic body in their relation to their fellow Greeks. His exaggerated estimate of the army of Xerxes has, for example, been imputed to a desire to magnify the prowess of his countrymen by whom that mighty host was annihilated. His assertion that the Athenians who fought at Marathon were the first Greeks who had ever ventured to stand up in pitched battle against a Persian foe, an assertion made in the face of his own previous accounts of gallant actions fought against the same enemy by the Hellenes of Asia minor, has been urged as proof of his anxiety to glorify the Athenians at the expense of their fellow Greeks. Neither of these passages seems, however, to afford valid ground for such charges; and they have already been cited in illustration of certain other defects of his historical method, which sufficiently account for both exaggerations irrespective of any undue favour towards those whose honour they may indirectly tend to promote.

Character of the Persians.

It would, however, be unreasonable to expect that a man of warm patriotic feeling, in a history of a long series of wars between his own nation and a rival race, should never have been led, even unconsciously, to express sentiments more favourable to his fellow-citizens than to their adversaries. And undoubtedly the general tone of the historian's narrative is one of admiration for the deeds, and favour to the cause, of his countrymen. But there is no appearance

of his having been led by these feelings wilfully to depreciate the character or conduct of the Persians. In forming our judgements in any such case, much must depend on a previous comparative estimate of the real merits of those whose conduct a historian is called upon to judge. It cannot be disputed that the Greeks were a people greatly superior, both socially and intellectually, to the Persians; superior in their system of civil government, in their art of war, in their science and civilisation at large; and the effects of this superiority could not fail to be strikingly exemplified in the course of a contest where the energies of each nation were strained to the uttermost. Accordingly the narrative of Herodotus, in so far as favourable to the one side or unfavourable to the other, appears to be so but as a narrative of facts; where the Greeks are neither represented as more superior to the Persians, nor the Persians as more inferior to the Greeks, than the reality justified.

As the historian's accounts of the dealings between the two nations relate chiefly to their wars, the inferiority of the Persians appears in the most prominent light in their military character; and is precisely of the same kind that has, in all ages, been observable in the oriental as compared with the European races. Herodotus himself assures us[1] that the defeat of Platæa was owing, not to any want of courage in the Persians, but to the inferiority of their arms and military discipline; and the heroic deeds of the two principal commanders, Mardonius and Masistius, who both fell desperately fighting, are extolled in high terms of eulogy. At Thermopylæ the valour of the Persian nobles, as contrasted with the defects of their

[1] IX. 62. sq.

military art, appears in a still stronger light. On that occasion the destruction of the little army of Leonidas was certain; no special display of gallantry was required on the side of the victors. The archers and slingers of the overwhelming force by which it was surrounded, might, from a distance and at their ease, have completed the work of massacre. But the historian describes the catastrophe as brought about by a murderous engagement, in which the flower of the Persian chivalry fought hand to hand with those terrible adversaries, and two brothers of Xerxes were slain. At the battle of Mycale, the Persians proper are equally remarkable for the obstinate courage with which, after the flight of the rest of the army, they disputed, inch by inch, the victorious advance of the entire Greek host. There can indeed be no better proof of the historian's anxiety to do justice to their merits, than the care with which on several occasions he impresses on us that the weakness of the imperial armies lay in the pusillanimity of the provincial troops, while the native Medes and Persians fought gallantly.[1] Even the defects imputed to them, their presumptuous self-confidence and vainglorious contempt for their Grecian foes, combined as they were with impetuous bravery, are generous defects, enhancing rather than detracting from the aggregate value of the Persian military character. In numerous other instances[2], as in the adventures of which Boges, Prexaspis, the Magi and their castigators are the heroes, the historian shows an evident satisfaction in dwelling on the martial prowess by which this people was distinguished.

[1] VIII. 68.

[2] VIII. 107., III. 74. sqq. 78.

THE PRIESTESSES OF JUNO ARGIVA

Argive Priestesses.

was a chronological compilation, arranged according to the succession of those venerable functionaries, and comprising notices of the more remarkable events that occurred during the ministry of each. How far the line of sacerdotal succession was followed out by Hellanicus we are not informed; but as its dates were standard epochs at the time of the Peloponnesian war, being quoted as such by Thucydides, it may be presumed that the catalogue extended down to historical times. The extant quotations, however, refer exclusively to the mythical age. The most valuable is that descriptive of the foundation of Rome. The tradition here followed by Hellanicus, while it differs from that of Antiochus the contemporary Sicilian historian, possesses a peculiar interest, as well from its coincidence in substance with that of Virgil, as from the discrepancy in the details of the two. We have seen elsewhere[1] that Stesichorus had represented Æneas, after the fall of Troy, as sailing for Hesperia, or the Land of the west. Hellanicus, like Virgil, describes him as retiring first to the coast of Thrace. In the course of his subsequent wanderings he meets Ulysses on an amicable footing in Molossia; whence the two heroes continue their westward voyage in company. On the coast of Latium the female followers of Æneas, wearied of their vagabond life, destroyed his fleet with fire. The instigator of this desperate act was a matron named Roma, after whom was called the city, founded on a convenient site in the region which she had been the means of securing for her fellow-wanderers as their final resting-

[1] Vol. III. p. 240.

place.[1] An account was also given of the migrations of the various Italian tribes across the straits of Messina, and of their colonisation of the isle of Sicily.[2]

Three books of this work are mentioned in the citations, the general tenor of which implies its contents to have been chiefly geographical; notices, that is, of the foundation of cities or colonies, at the various sacerdotal epochs which formed the connecting links of the narrative.

Carneonicæ.

The Carneonicæ[3], while resembling the work just described in its plan and arrangement, possesses interest as one of the first essays in literary history of which mention occurs in Grecian literature. It was a Chronicle of the victors in the Carnean games, the chief musical festival of Sparta, founded in 676 B.C. under the direction of the Lesbian musician Terpander. The solemnities of this festival continued to be regulated by a succession of distinguished musicians of the same school and country. Hence, probably, the peculiar interest taken in the subject by the Lesbian historian. Of the only three extant fragments[4], one relates to the epoch of the institution and of its author; the other to a no less celebrated Lesbian musician Arion, inventor of the Cyclic chorus or Dithyramb, and whose sphere of activity may probably have extended, like that of Terpander, to the Spartan Carnea.

[1] Frg. 53.

[2] Frg. 53.: conf. 51.

[3] Athenæus, in his citation of the Carneonicæ (frg. 122.), appears to distinguish two works of Hellanicus bearing that name; the one in verse, the other in prose. Suidas also mentions poetical works of Hellanicus. But neither passage is sufficiently precise or authentic to warrant our assuming, amid the general silence of antiquity, that Hellanicus was a poet as well as a historian.

[4] Frgg. 122, 123. 85. There can be no doubt that κραναϊκοῖς in the last-quoted citation, ranged by C. Müller as a separate title, is a mere corruption of καρνεονίκαις.

seem to have been a principle of Persian public law, admitted even by such arbitrary despots as Darius and Xerxes, that every Persian public servant, whether successful or unfortunate in his undertakings, had to the best of his ability done his duty. There is no trace of the bowstring system common in oriental countries, where civil and military officers are made responsible with their lives, not for the zeal but for the success of their services. Mardonius, in spite of the disastrous issue of his first Athenian expedition, continued to retain his place in the favour of both monarchs; nor are Datis and Artaphernes mentioned as having been disgraced for the still more humiliating result of the campaign of Marathon. The historian's graphic picture of the follies or vices of those despots is also relieved by favourable traits. Their outbreaks of wanton cruelty are redeemed by occasional acts of generosity, and by a grateful appreciation of good services rendered. Nor do we hear of their being guilty of any of those unjustifiable breaches of the law of nations, several of which Herodotus records against his own countrymen.

His imputed favour to the Athenians,

21. In regard to the historian's supposed favour to the Athenians at the expense of their fellow Greeks, it is necessary, as in the case of the Persians, well to weigh the previous question, how far such favour be not rather an impartial expression of well-merited approval than the blind eulogy of a partisan. There can be no doubt of the high admiration of Herodotus for the character of this people, and for their noble sacrifices in support of Hellenic independence. This feeling manifests itself both in the general tone of his narrative, and in the formal judgement passed by him on their conduct, as compared with that of other

leading Greek states. But before a charge of unfair partiality can be founded on any such basis, we must have solid ground of belief that his good opinion was unworthily bestowed. It has been urged that the fact of Herodotus having, when forced to abandon his native country, selected Athens as his place of refuge, and having spent the remainder of his life under the patronage of that republic, is in itself a primary ground for doubting the impartiality of a narrative so decidedly favourable to the Athenians. Might it not with equal reason be argued, that the motive which first induced a Dorian stranger to place himself by preference under the protection of the head of the Ionian confederacy, was a feeling of respect for those excellencies of her character or conduct which he afterwards undertook to describe? But in truth the merits of the Athenians, as exhibited during the Persian war, have not been disputed by any author of credit who treats of this period. Both the genuine Plutarch, Bœotian as he was, in his biographical sketches, and the Pseudo-Plutarch in his attack on the historian, represent the part acted by the Athenians in substantially the same light as it appears in Herodotus. It is not so much on the ground of favour shown to the Athenians, as of harshness and injustice towards the other Greeks, that the Pseudo-Plutarch rests his argument of malignity; and he even accuses the historian of having in some cases enviously suppressed the honourable deeds of Athens in the same manner as those of other members of the confederacy.

And injustice to the Corinthians.

The Hellenic states considered to have the best reason to complain of injustice done them by the historian, are Sparta, Corinth, and Argos. Any re-

marks on the case of Sparta will be better reserved for the sequel. The complaint of the Corinthians affords stronger evidence of their own vain pretensions than of the historian's slowness to appreciate their real merits. A concise abstract of the several passages in which their affairs are referred to in connexion with Athens, while tending to elucidate one or two obscure points of Greek history, will also show that Corinth, if not among the most favoured nations of Herodotus, was not certainly among those which he desired to vilify.

When the Athenians were involved in a quarrel with Thebes, by having undertaken to protect Platæa against Theban oppression, the Corinthians were called in as arbiters, and their award was favourable to the Athenians and to the cause of liberty.[1] In the course of the invidious hostilities fomented by Sparta against Athens after the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ, a coalition of Dorian and Bœotian states was formed for the invasion of Attica; when the Corinthians, convinced of the injustice of the enterprise, withdrew their forces, which step on their part was a main cause of its abandonment.[2] Soon after, in a council of Dorian states held to concert measures for checking the growing power of Athens, it was proposed by the Spartan delegate to reestablish Hippias by force of arms in his despotic government. Here again the Corinthians interpose[3], and in a long and interesting address, declare in no measured terms their feelings of surprise and offence at so base a proposal. The result as before was an abandonment of the scheme. In all this there is

[1] iv. 108 [2] v. 75. [3] v. 92.

certainly no appearance of disfavour to Corinth on the part of Herodotus, especially in her dealings with Athens. In the immediate sequel the two states appear united by close ties of amity; and in the war waged by Athens, then deficient in naval resources, against Thebes and Ægina, she was presented by Corinth with the magnificent present of twenty war galleys.[1] This friendship however had come completely to an end before the outbreak of the Persian war. During the early operations of the Greek fleet, Adimantus the leader of the Corinthian squadron is the keenest opponent of the naval policy of Themistocles; but is described as having been induced by a bribe from that commander to acquiesce in his views[2]; a transaction not very creditable certainly to the Corinthian honour. But as Eurybiades the Spartan admiral in chief accepts a similar bribe from the same Themistocles, and as Themistocles had himself been bribed by the Eubœans to adopt his present policy by a sum four times greater than that paid by him to his fellow-commanders, none of the parties have much reason to complain of partiality to their neighbours in the historian's report of the transaction. The altered feeling between the two states further displays itself with marked virulence in the insults offered by Adimantus to Themistocles in the war councils, and afterwards in the injurious reports circulated by the Athenians of the conduct of the Corinthians in the battle of Salamis. It is here again to be regretted that Herodotus, instead of his scandalous anecdotes of the court of Periander, should not rather have afforded us some explanation of the transition from friend-

[1] VI. 89. [2] VIII. 4. sq. 59. 61.

ship to enmity between the two republics during the ten years since the war of Athens and Ægina. But the cause of the change which his own indirect notices imply, is the mortification of the Corinthians at seeing their antient naval superiority, celebrated by both Herodotus and Thucydides, pass so completely as it had done from their hands into those of the Athenians their former friends. A few years before the battle of Salamis Athens was unable, without the aid of Corinth, to muster a fleet fit to cope with that of Ægina. The ships of Athens at Salamis were 127; those of Corinth, 40. The bitterness displayed by Adimantus towards Themistocles personally tends to confirm this view. For to the policy of Themistocles it was, as Herodotus also pointedly informs us[1], that Athens was indebted for her sudden increase of naval power.

The mention by Herodotus[2] of the injurious, and probably calumnious reports circulated by the Athenians as to the panic flight of the Corinthians in the battle of Salamis, was the chief ground on which the latter people rested their charge of injustice towards them in his account of the war. But no unprejudiced reader of the passage, especially of its concluding paragraph, will discover in it any such tendency. "This," says the historian, "is the story told by the Athenians; but the Corinthians assert that they fought from the first in the foremost rank, and their assertion is supported by the testimony of the rest of the Greeks." The historian may here perhaps lie open to the charge of having indirectly stigmatised the Athenians as calumniators, but he can hardly be taxed

[1] VII. 144. [2] VIII. 94.

with having stigmatised the Corinthians as cowards. He has on this, as on other occasions, thought fit to introduce any popular legend current in reference to important events, especially when, as in the present case, seasoned with marvellous or supernatural details; and this one happened not to be entirely complimentary to the Corinthians; but he could hardly have told his tale in a more fair and candid manner. The vanity of Corinth was, however, as tender as it was great; and was hurt at being made so much as the subject of such an anecdote.[1]

His judgement of the Thessalians.

22. A more reasonable charge against Herodotus than that of partiality to individual states, is that of harshness or malignity in his judgements of those who, while ostensibly true to the national cause, appeared to him less sincere than others in their efforts to serve it. Against several of these he is even more severe than against those who stood aloof or openly sided with the enemy. His allusions to some of the latter more notorious offenders are indeed remarkable for a spirit of indulgence. The Thessalians had in the first instance given in their allegiance to the great king. But when it became his declared intention to reduce Greece to the form of a Persian province, they determined, the historian tells us, to join in opposing his advance. Nor was it until the confederate force retired upon central Greece and left the Thessalians to their fate, that they made common cause with the invader[2]; and He-

[1] The Corinthians are among the states, comprising the whole confederacy except Sparta, Athens, Platæa, and Tegea, whose troops are described as behaving ill at Platæa. But at Mycale the same Corinthians are represented as redeeming their lost credit by bearing, in conjunction with the Athenians, Sicyonians, and Trœzenians, the brunt of the hostile attack; and by gallantly in the same company striving to win, and succeeding in winning the battle, before the arrival of the Spartans. IX. 102.

[2] VII. 172—174.

rodotus seems to consider it rather to their credit, that having once resolved on this course they showed themselves zealous allies of Xerxes. He also comments in very lenient terms[1] on the refusal of the Argives to join the national cause, and seems to admit the validity of the grounds on which that refusal rested. "The destruction by the Spartans some years before, of the flower of their able-bodied citizens, had not only (they admitted) indisposed them to cooperate with those whom they had found more cruel enemies than the Medes were likely to prove, but had incapacitated them from doing so in an effective manner; while the result of any further serious loss to their now reduced military force in an action with the Persians, would be but to place them more completely in the hands of their Spartan persecutors." Even the Thebans, who so loudly complained of the "malignity of Herodotus," seem to have been as handsomely treated by him as by other leading Greek annalists. Their zealous support of the Persians was notorious, and Herodotus is certainly far from extenuating their delinquency. But he readily gives them credit for any more generous traits of character or conduct by which their crime may have been relieved. After the battle of Platæa Pausanias, he informs us, summoned them to deliver up the political chiefs under whose guidance they had acted, threatening in case of refusal to lay waste their territory and assault their city. The citizens rejected this demand on the ground, that as all were equally guilty it was but fair that all should equally submit to the punishment. After three weeks of siege and suffering, the chiefs, unwilling to prolong

Argives,

Thebans.

[1] VII. 148. sqq.

the calamities of their country, voluntarily surrendered themselves. Whatever may have been the previous political offences of either people or magistrates, the conduct imputed to both on this occasion is highly commendable.[1]

Minor Greek states.

While thus indulgent towards the greater criminals, Herodotus seems to be at pains to place the conduct of less palpable offenders in an unfavourable light. When Xerxes, before setting out on his expedition, sent a final demand of allegiance from the Greek states: "Some," says the historian, "readily complied, while many who refused did so with fear and reluctance, being in their hearts favourable to the Medes."[2] He afterwards tells us that "the only reason why the Phocians adhered to the patriotic cause was, that the Thessalians their old and bitter enemies had joined the invader; and that had the Thessalians remained steady the Phocians would have sided with Xerxes."[3] He denounces the Achæans, and some other small states of Peloponnesus, as in their hearts partisans of the Medes.[4] The Corcyræans are described[5] as arranging their scheme of treachery in so ingenious a manner, that while openly taking neither side they might be ready, whichever party succeeded, to claim merit as its supporter. The misconduct of most of the smaller

[1] IX. 86. 88. In a speech placed by Thucydides (III. 62.) in the mouth of the Thebans, they are made to assert that their city was at the period of the Persian invasion subject to an oligarchy, by whom they were coerced into obedience to the invader. This account, in which Plutarch (in Aristid. XVIII.) concurs, is not more favourable to their honour than that of Herodotus; they being here represented as victims, not of the irresistible power of Xerxes, but of a few petty despots within their own city. That Thebes was in any case a willing slave to those despots, is evinced by the fact of her having made no effort to shake off their thraldom, at a moment too when the sympathies of Athens, Sparta, and other leading states, would have abundantly guaranteed her success.

[2] VII. 138. [3] VIII. 30. [4] VII. 138., VIII. 72. [5] VII. 168.

states at the battle of Platæa, which a more lenient censor might have attributed to defect of judgement or of discipline, is stigmatised by Herodotus, in the words of Pausanias, as "panic flight," and "treachery."[1] He also places their fault in a ludicrous as well as an offensive light, by the anecdote, the truth of which he vindicates, of their having attempted to impose on posterity by causing fictitious tombs to be erected on the to them bloodless field of battle, as if in honour of their slain warriors, by the side of the real graves of their victorious countrymen.[2] His impartiality in working up these parts of his narrative may be inferred from the circumstance, that the Æginetes, to whom he awards the palm of valour over his favourite Athenians at Salamis, are included in the common stigma upon this occasion. His motive for animadverting more severely on the demerits of these smaller states than on the more glaring misconduct of their stronger neighbours was, no doubt, that the offence of the former being less notorious, they were accustomed, under the ægis of their obscurity, to arrogate to themselves a full share in the national glory to which they had so little claim. The anecdote of the sham sepulchres is a curious example of the expedients resorted to for sustaining their empty pretensions.

There is the less reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of these details of the historian's narrative, that such conduct in like circumstances is but too much in harmony with the general experience of history. The jealousies apt to spring up within such a political body as republican Greece, are at all times among the most powerful passions by which human

[1] ix. 60. [2] ix. 85.

nature can be agitated, and often suffice to outweigh the nobler impulses of national patriotism in a crisis like the Persian war. There was at this time no want of such jealousies in the bosom of the Hellenic body; no want of cases in which a desire for the humiliation of a haughty rival or an oppressive neighbour would secure a ready ear to the demands of a foreign invader, whose power seemed to render resistance hopeless, and who was distinguished for mild treatment of willing vassals. The golden rule, that "'tis better to bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of," is as little regarded in the political as the social relations of life. Had Greece become a province of Persia, the late partisans of the conqueror might have been the first to complain of his oppression and to conspire against him. But the influence of present chagrin was stronger than that of alarm for the future. The case of the Argives supplies a striking proof of the force of such feelings. The simple fact that the only Dorian state which deserted the national cause, a state hitherto distinguished for free and martial spirit, should have been the one between whom and Sparta, the dominant Dorian republic, a bitter antagonism had so long subsisted, during which Argos had been almost invariably worsted, and at times barbarously outraged,—this fact would, even apart from the historian's testimony, justify the inference that hatred to Sparta and a lurking desire to see her exposed to the same outrages inflicted by her on others, was the ruling motive with the seceding state. "The Phocians," we are also told, "so hated the Thessalians, that they remained true to the patriotic cause when the Thessalians took the other side; had the Thessalians continued steady, the

Phocians would have deserted." Herodotus has been less specific in assigning motives in other cases. But from the analogy of the above two examples we may the more readily defer to the statement of Pausanias[1] that the twelve Achæan states of northern Peloponnesus, described as secretly favouring the Medes, did so from ill-will to the ruling Dorian powers, by whom their ancestors had been ejected from their fairest possessions, and on whom they still continued to look with a jealous if not a hostile eye.

Antagonism of Thebes and Athens.

23. But this argument may be still further extended. What induced Thebes, hitherto one of the most independent-spirited commonwealths in Greece, to espouse from the first so cordially the cause of an alien enemy? No direct answer has been given by Herodotus to this question; but with the notices which he supplies of the previous history of the republic, the critical reader will have little difficulty in answering for himself: hatred of the Athenians. From time immemorial Thebes and Athens had been on a footing of antagonism similar to that between Argos and Sparta. The Thebans, like the Argives, had always been the losing party, and had lately been subjected to equally galling defeats and humiliations. The unfriendly relations between the two states are reflected even in their fabulous traditions. Athens in the old Cadmean wars is the usual asylum of the refugees from the rival state, with whom she is at times brought into hostile collision by her generous conduct. At a more recent period she affords a similar refuge and political rights to the Gephyræans when ejected by the Thebans from their native seats.[2]

[1] VII. 6.: conf. Thucyd. III. 92.

[2] V. 57.

From this new tribe of citizens sprang the celebrated vindicators of Attic freedom, Harmodius and Aristogiton; while the Thebans, by an appropriate coincidence, were among the enemies of that freedom who subscribed most liberally to the fund for reinstating Pisistratus when ejected from his usurped dominion.[1] Not long after when the Platæans, harassed by the oppression of the Thebans, threw up their connexion with the Bœotian league, they were taken under the protection of Athens. The Thebans, enraged at this defection of a vassal state, attacked the city of Platæa. The Athenians came to the rescue, beat the Thebans, invaded the Theban territory, and in the ensuing truce exacted an extension of the Platæan frontier at the expense of the enemy.[2] In the sequel the Thebans, with their neighbours the Chalcidians of Eubœa, combine with the Dorian league for the humiliation of Athens. When that ill-devised coalition fell to pieces, both Thebans and Chalcidians left to fight out their own battle were invaded and successively defeated by the Athenians.[3] The consequence was the occupation of Chalcis by the victors, and the establishment of Athenian ascendancy in Eubœa by the settlement of a colony of 4000 Attic portioners on the Chalcidian territory. By this encroachment the honour and interest of Thebes also were severely affected; her hated rival being thus entrenched in hostile attitude along the whole maritime frontier of Bœotia. A large body of prisoners of rank, both Thebans and Chalcidians, were transported to Athens, and kept in chains till ransomed by their friends; and those chains were still preserved

[1] I. 61. [2] VI. 108. [3] V. 74. 77. sq.

in the acropolis in the historian's time, with other trophies of old Athenian victory, scorched, like the antient wall on which they hung, by the fire of the Medes. So completely was the power of Thebes broken by these disasters, that, hopeless of retrieving her fortunes by her own resources, she enlists[1] in her defence first the Pythoness and then some of her late Dorian allies, the result of whose cooperation was rather to promote than check the now rapid growth of Athenian ascendancy.

The next occasion on which Thebes appears in a prominent capacity is as leader of the Greek states favourable to the Medes. It could hardly be otherwise; Athens being the leader of those who asserted the national independence. The expedition of Xerxes, it will also be remembered, was specially directed against Athens, as the original aggressor in the quarrel between them. To occupy Attica and burn Athens was the declared object of his armament. Was Thebes, who hated the Athenians with at least as cordial a hatred as did Xerxes himself, and whose policy had been so long guided by thirst of revenge for the injuries sustained at their hands, now to come forward as their protector? The concurrence of circumstances tending to inflame this spirit of animosity was very remarkable. While the brilliant exploit of Marathon could be to her, at the best, but a source of mortification, the large share in the glory which fell to the lot of her revolted vassal Platæa, must have added gall to the bitterness of that feeling. The triumph of such a pair of confederates was both an evidence and a result of the political

[1] v. 79. sq.

ascendancy which Athens, ever since the quarrel on the subject of Platæa, had been acquiring at her expense. The case of Athens and Thebes might therefore safely have been ranked by Herodotus in the same category as that of Sparta and Argos, or Thessaly and Phocis. Whichever side the Athenians took, the Thebans would assuredly have been found in the opposite ranks.

"Malignity" of Herodotus.

The foregoing illustrations, founded solely or chiefly on the internal data of the historian's text, will, it is hoped, amply vindicate, not only his general impartiality, but his critical accuracy in the treatment of this most important crisis in the annals of his country. It must also however be admitted, that the judgements passed by him on his countrymen, even on those who were not chargeable with treachery or defection from the national cause, are seasoned at times by a sarcastic severity, which justifies in some measure the charge of "malignity" brought against him by "Plutarch." But at the same time it convincingly proves, that if an extensive popularity was a favourite object with him, it was one which he was not disposed to purchase by flattery. He seems indeed to take special pleasure in telling unpalatable truths to those who least expected to hear them. He charges[1] the Athenian, Spartan, and Corinthian commanders at Artemisium, with allowing themselves to be bribed by so many talents apiece to the support of measures which a sense of public duty had not induced them to sanction. He represents the policy of the Lacedæmonians towards both rivals and allies as a systematic course of Macchiavellian duplicity. He asserts, in particular[2], that the advice given by

[1] VIII. 4. sqq. [2] VI. 108.

Sparta to the Platæans on the occasion above noticed, to appeal to the protection of Athens against Theban oppression, was dictated by no good will to the Platæans, but merely by the hope of embroiling the rival power in disputes with her Bœotian neighbours. He is careful to inform us how the solitary act of liberality which he records of the Spartans, their delivery of Athens from the Pisistratidæ, was only wrung from them by the pertinacious injunctions of the Pythoness, bribed by the Alcmæonidæ to espouse the cause of Attic freedom; and how, on discovering the fraud, they not only repented them of their services in that cause, but set on foot measures for reestablishing the tyrannical government.[1] In the sequel he accuses the same Spartans, in common with the whole Peloponnesian confederacy, of endeavouring by a steady course of double-dealing to throw the whole burthen and calamity of the Persian war on the states of northern Greece, especially on Athens, and reserve the common resources for the defence of their own territory.[2] And in describing one of the most critical turns of the ill-combined manœuvres of the battle of Platæa, he remarks, that the Athenians had the greater difficulty in deciding how to act in concert with their Spartan allies, from past experience of their habit "of thinking one thing and saying another."[3]

[1] v. 90. sq. [2] viii. 142. sq., ix. 6. sq. [3] ix. 54.

# CHAP. VII.

## HERODOTUS: HIS COMPOSITION AND STYLE.

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HISTORIAN'S SUBJECT. — 2. HIS PRINCIPAL NARRATIVE AND EPISODES. — 3. GENERAL HARMONY OF THEIR EPIC COMBINATION. — 4. INAPPROPRIATE OR MISPLACED EPISODES. — 5. CONCENTRATION OF THE ACTION ON THE AFFAIRS OF GREECE. CLOSE OF THE NARRATIVE. ITS MERITS AND DEFECTS. EXISTING SUBDIVISION OF THE TEXT. — 6. THE HISTORIAN'S DELINEATION OF CHARACTER. — 7. CYRUS. CAMBYSES. DARIUS. XERXES. — 8. CRŒSUS. COMMON OR CONVENTIONAL TRAITS OF CHARACTER. AMASIS.—9. HELLENIC CHARACTER. THE ATHENIANS. THEIR DISINTERESTED PATRIOTISM. THEIR HUMANITY. THEIR LEVITY. — 10. THE SPARTANS. THEIR MACCHIAVELLIAN SELFISHNESS. THEIR MILITARY PROWESS. ANTI-ATTIC FEELING OF THE CONFEDERACY. — 11. INDIVIDUAL GREEK CHARACTERS. THEMISTOCLES. CLEOMENES. PERIANDER.— 12. DRAMATIC ELEMENT OF THE HISTORIAN'S STYLE. SPEECHES. — 13. DIALOGUE. — 14. HIS DESCRIPTIVE POWERS. BATTLE OF MARATHON. — 15. HIS LANGUAGE IN STRUCTURE AND DIALECT. PARALLEL OF HOMER.

Epic characteristics of the historian's subject.

1. THE duty devolving on the critic of Herodotus has not hitherto been altogether of the most agreeable nature. The merits of the historian, in so far as exemplified in the features of his composition specially examined in the previous pages, being for the most part obvious or generally recognised, called for comparatively little remark. The defects, on the other hand, being chiefly defects of detail, and such as seemed to have received from previous commentators a less careful consideration than was due to their importance in the general estimate of the author's genius, demanded a somewhat closer analysis. In the sequel, though censure may not be excluded, the task of administering it will be subordinate to that of pointing out the beauties which so greatly outnumber the blemishes that still remain to be noticed.

Every narrative composition, as a work of art, in respect, that is, to its power of gratifying the taste by the order and propriety of its arrangement, requires to be judged by the same fundamental rules formerly noticed in their application to that peculiar class of narrative called the Epic poem. The heroic ballad and the popular fireside tale, the Homeric epopee and the prose history, much as they may differ as to character, bulk, or materials, are all more or less dependent for their power of fixing the attention or enlisting the sympathies of an audience, on the degree in which they possess the attribute of unity of composition. This unity consists in the concentration of the subject around some principal head of action, supplying a continuous bond of connexion to the parts with each other and with the whole body to which they belong, and enabling us clearly to apprehend and follow the vicissitudes of a prolonged and varied series of events.

As different subjects may possess different degrees of natural or intrinsic epic unity, the success of a narrative, irrespective of the merit of its treatment, may depend greatly on the author's happy selection of his subject, or on his good fortune in finding one combining high epic capabilities with a general adaptation to his own talents and to the taste of his public. In this respect, the historian of real transactions lies under a disadvantage as compared with the author in the more imaginative branches of composition. The poet may select his materials from the entire range of real history or popular tradition; he may at discretion amplify, curtail, or otherwise mould them to his purpose; and where neither history nor tradition offers such as suit that purpose, he may

freely tax the resources of his own invention to supply the deficiency. The case of the historian is very different. While the poet ranges at will through every realm of truth or fiction, the historian, by the fundamental law of his art, is restricted to truth alone. Invention is denied him altogether; and even the privilege of varying or modifying his materials is confined within the limits of a corresponding variety in the authorities from whom they are derived. The whole number of subjects at his disposal being thus limited, those which either spontaneously offer any higher features of epic unity, or which can by a legitimate exercise of ingenuity be invested with them, are proportionally rare. The realities of human life pursue their appointed course, regardless of the difficulties which its uniformity or eccentricity may entail on those who undertake to investigate or describe it; and a glance at the page of universal history will show how rarely the actual current of events is favourable to epic unity in historical narrative. The only country of modern Europe, the history of which presents a great and united epic subject, is England. From the epoch of the Saxon occupation down to the revolution, every leading event of the British annals, whether as contributing to form, by an admixture of races, that highest modern development of human nature—the British character, or as tending to elicit and mature the noblest result of the action and influence of that character — the British constitution, connects itself with its neighbour, and with the series to which it belongs, by as constant a chain of cause and effect as that which connects the events of the Iliad with the Anger of Achilles. To this great subject full justice has been done by the greatest modern

master of the historical art. If we turn to the other contemporary nations of highest rank, the contrast is striking The history of France, whatever variety of instructive vicissitudes it may present, is yet, as a whole, in an epic as in a political sense, as devoid of definite issue as of definite object. Events appear to succeed each other in a series of unconnected individuality; or, in so far as grouping themselves into masses, offer not so much a sequel to, as a reversal of, the previous state of things. Nor can the annals of any one of the more prominent members of the modern European system advance much better claims to the highest order of historical unity.

Here, as in so many other respects, the Hellenic nation has been especially favoured in the abundance of her materials, as of her talents, for the cultivation of intellectual art. The history of a single people may comprise more than one great epic subject; and three such subjects may be recognised in the history of Greece. The first is that chosen by Herodotus. It comprehends the early annals of his own country, in connexion with those of other leading races of the antient world, and is concentrated around that long course of national antagonism which terminated in the victorious ascendancy of the Hellenes over their Asiatic rivals. The second has its bond of unity in a no less animated course of political and martial rivalry, that between the two principal sections of the Hellenic body, ranged under the banners of their respective leaders the Athenians and Lacedæmonians, and terminates in the ascendancy of Lacedæmon. The third embraces the rise, progress, and ultimate supremacy of the Macedonian power in Greece, and the conquest, by the greatest Helleno-Macedonian

monarch, of that vast empire which a few generations before had temporarily at least conquered both Macedonia and the greater part of Hellas.

Principal narrative and episodes.

2. The more prominent features of the plan and structure of the historian's work have been incidentally noticed in our remarks on the historical value of its contents. It will now be proper to examine them in connexion with its merits as a literary composition. The epic centre of the narrative is, as already remarked, the national rivalry between the Hellenic and Asiatic races. The Persians being the aggressors, and their history offering a more distinctly marked course of progress, as well as a greater intrinsic unity than that of Greece, naturally assume the position of protagonists. The main action consists in the successive reduction by their arms of the older degenerate oriental nations, on whose ruins their own empire was constructed, and in occasional, for the most part abortive attacks on the younger hardier races on their more distant frontier; their grand attempt on Greece with its humiliating failure forms the catastrophe of the whole. Around this nucleus of principal matter are ranged episodical sketches of the previous history or present condition of the nations brought on the scene. But the plan of Herodotus was not limited to historical narrative in the stricter sense. It was also to hold up to his countrymen a picture of all that was most interesting for them to know or to contemplate in the world at large in connexion with his general subject. Hence a very large portion of his text is devoted to geographical description. We had formerly occasion to notice how, in the natural progress of intellectual pursuit, Geography became the mother of History;

and the same causes contributed, even after the claims of the daughter on general interest had acquired a marked superiority, to maintain her in a certain dependence on the parent science. A knowledge of the scenes on which remarkable events take place, and of the native country and habits of those engaged in them, is always necessary to a right understanding of a historical work. This knowledge, however, since the more accurate division of literary labour consequent on a general advance of scientific pursuit, has been provided for by other branches of composition; and the historian is only expected to supply it in special cases, either where his scene of action extends over countries unexplored or little known, or where more detailed topographical notices may be indispensable to a full understanding of his description of particular occurrences. But the scene of action in the work of Herodotus lay chiefly in countries so little explored, or so imperfectly known to his public, as to render it one of his principal duties not only to collect fresh information from the best secondary sources within his reach, but to undertake long journeys in order to obtain it from the fountain head. It was further consistent with the general scheme of his work, to afford his readers the benefit of his geographical researches even where extending beyond the strictly historical exigencies of his narrative. The term geographical must consequently here be understood in the widest sense, as comprising descriptions of manners and customs civil and religious; of natural productions, works of art, and other remarkable objects. Nor are these descriptions confined to countries the political history of which formed part of his general subject, but

extend at times to regions lying altogether beyond his immediate theatre of action. The only countries on the other hand, to the political affairs of which any considerable attention has been devoted without a corresponding notice of their geography, are such as were assumed to be familiarly known to the author's own public; Greece more especially, and the neighbouring coasts and islands the occupation of which by Greek colonies constituted them provinces of Hellas.

The episodes hitherto noticed are such as, if not essentially required in a historical composition, yet possess a more or less historical character. But the work of Herodotus also abounds in another species of accessary matter which can lay no solid claim to any such character; in miscellaneous anecdotes of a popular or familiar nature, accounts of marvellous adventures, and strange or supernatural phenomena. These portions of the text are evidently intended to amuse rather than instruct his readers, and to insure his work a more general popularity with that portion of his public, no inconsiderable one probably, which was more easily attracted by such notices than by the graver realities of political history.

The main action of his great historical epopee satisfies the utmost demands of epic unity. Considering the long period of time and the vast range of interests which it comprehends, it will, if reduced to its primary elements on the principle laid down by Aristotle, be found proportionally as remarkable for simplicity as that of the Odyssey, from which the critic's illustration of his principle, quoted in a previous volume[1], has been drawn. The substance of the historian's narrative might be embodied with

[1] Vol. I. p. 297.

corresponding conciseness in the following summary. "Cyrus prince of Persia deposes Astyages king of the Medes, and establishes the Persian rule over western Asia. He is defeated and slain in an expedition against the Tartar races of his northern frontier. His son Cambyses conquers Egypt, but fails in an attempt on Ethiopia. On his death a Median priest usurps the government, but is slain by the Persian nobles, one of whom named Darius ascends the throne. He subdues Thrace; is baffled in an attempt on Scythia; plans the conquest of Greece, and sends an expedition against Attica, which is beaten off by the Athenians. His son and successor Xerxes invades Greece by land and sea, but is defeated and driven back to his own country, and the independence of Greece is permanently secured against Asiatic aggression." "This," to borrow the terms of the Stagirite critic, "forms the main action of the history of Herodotus. The remainder," comprising a large, perhaps the largest, portion of the narrative, "is but episode." Such is the whole second book upon Egypt; such the early history or descriptive geography of Lydia and Media; of Assyria, India, and Arabia; of Libya, Scythia, and other foreign countries, in so far as the notices of them are retrospective, and not immediately connected with the interference of Persia in their concerns; such the whole history of Greece itself down to the attack made on Sardis by the Athenians, an incident of momentous importance, both in the historian's narrative and in the common destinies of Greece and Persia.

General harmony of their combination.

3. When we consider the large portion of the text occupied by episodes, even taking the term in the familiar and much narrower sense than that in which

Aristotle has used it, and the extensive breaches which they cause in the continuity of the principal narrative, the harmony of the entire combination is calculated to produce surprise as well as admiration. Widely as the tale diverges from its direct course, and numerous as are the by-paths into which it wanders, its thread scarcely ever appears to be seriously interrupted or entangled. This harmony may be attributed to two principal causes: the propriety of the occasion and mode in which the episodical matter is introduced, and the distinctness of form and substance which the author has imparted to his principal masses. His longer digressions, descriptive of the countries invaded or subdued by the Persians, are, it will be observed, made immediately to precede the account of such invasion or conquest; forming an introduction to a new head of principal subject rather than a supplement to that which preceded, and thus extending, rather than interrupting or overcharging, the general course of the narrative. This remark may be illustrated by the example of the second book, devoted to Egypt. The previous book had concluded with the death of Cyrus, and with his life the first grand section of the author's history of Asia is also brought to a close; the subjection of that entire region having been completed by the same Cyrus. The opening chapter of the second book announces the succession of Cambyses and his projected invasion of Egypt, which enterprise constitutes the chief feature of that monarch's reign, and the second act of the great drama of Persian conquest. Immediately upon this announcement we enter with obvious propriety on the author's special account of the new scene of action, occupying, in strictly episodical form, upwards

of an eighth part of the whole work. But we turn at its close to Cambyses, whom we left on the frontier of the country preparing his measures, and accompany him on his expedition with as fresh a recollection of previous events as if we had never parted from him. Herodotus in his longer episodes, while profusely enlarging on the geography and statistics of the countries which they describe, seems also, whether in spontaneously following the dictates of his own taste, or with the deliberate object of imparting consistency to these portions of his text, to have limited his historical notices of the same countries, with rare exception, to their internal politics. In his episode on Assyria he himself informs us that he reserves the historical account of that empire for a separate work. In his Egyptian episode he bestows a certain attention on the internal history of the country. But to the previous wars and varied political relations between Egypt and the great powers to the eastward, of which we have ample knowledge from other sources, scarcely an allusion occurs. The legend of Sesostris may seem to form an exception, but it is one more apparent than real. The exploits of that celebrated hero, as recorded by Herodotus, belong to an age long prior to that with which his own main subject opens, and have no connexion with the realities of history. He overruns the world like his mythical contemporaries Dionysus and Hercules, carrying everything before him, but leaving no evidences of Egyptian power or presence behind him. The name of no historical personage, either pagan or scriptural, subdued by him is specified; nor do we hear among the nations asserted to have been annexed to his empire any tradition concerning him. On the contrary, the same

Scythians who in the Egyptian episode are described as conquered by Sesostris[1] are in the Scythian episode pointedly characterised as invincible, and as never having been subdued by any human warrior.[2] Nor, in the notices of the early Lydian dynasties, do we hear of any interruption of their rule by an Egyptian invader, although Lydia is among the countries subdued by the Sesostris of the Egyptian episode. These are inconsistencies of fact which, while forming, with others of a like description noticed in other places, serious drawbacks on the historical credit of Herodotus, afford the better evidence of his anxiety to impart individual integrity to his heads of episodical matter. This tendency is similarly illustrated in his episode on Scythia, the next in length to that on Egypt. His accounts of the foreign expeditions of the Scythian tribes, of their temporary conquests of Lydia and central Asia, with their exaction of tribute from Egypt, are all introduced in the early portion of the main narrative devoted to the great Asiatic empires. In the Scythian episode they are barely alluded to.

In regard to the shorter, more incidental class of episodes which abound in the historian's pages, we have already pointed out the large portion of them devoted to matters of little or no historical importance or even to mere gossiping anecdote, as a drawback on the intrinsic historical value of the work. These excursions however are less objectionable in a literary point of view; as tending to relieve the main body of the narrative rather than surcharge it, which might have been the effect of a like accumulation of

[1] II. 103. 110. [2] IV. 46.

details of graver historical character. The case may be compared to that of a spacious architectural edifice, the effect of which would be damaged by an increase of principal parts, while an equal number of light decorative accessaries contributes in a proportional degree to its unity and elegance. Much may also be due, both in his lighter and his graver excursions, to the pervading ease and perspicuity of his style, which places every event or object, each in its individual form as in their collective masses, so clearly before us, as to secure to all a distinct and permanent place in the memory.

Inappropriate or misplaced episodes.

4. Herodotus has not however been always equally successful, either in the selection or the adjustment of his episodes. One of the most defective parts of his work is the digression on the Cyrenian colonies of northern Africa in the fourth book. The subject here not only possesses in itself comparatively little historical interest, but is peculiarly deficient in that liveliness of excursive detail which often makes amends for the want of more solid advantages; while the connexion between the affairs of the countries described and the main narrative is so slight, that it could hardly have justified so long a commentary on them, even had the materials which they supply been of a more attractive nature. The episode forms, it is true, the introduction to a Persian expedition against those countries, not however to a mighty imperial enterprise like those of Cambyses and Darius against Egypt or Scythia, but to one undertaken by a subordinate officer against an inferior enemy, and abortive in its issue. The account of the indigenous Libyan races embodied in the same digression, while in its more prominent particulars essentially fabulous,

is more entertaining than that of the revolutions of Cyrene or Barca; but as the Persians never penetrated into those regions, and as their inhabitants are never in any shape brought on the historical stage, so minute a description of them seems quite uncalled for. Had the historian availed himself of some incidental link of connexion between the affairs of Carthage and those of the neighbouring African states, to give us in similar detail his version of the origin and early history of that celebrated republic, the inestimable value of the matter would have more than compensated for any want of aptitude in the manner of its introduction.

The author's summary of Universal geography is also quite out of place in his chapter on Scythia where it now stands.[1] It may be a question whether any such general "description of the earth," whatever position in the text it may have occupied, was either necessary or desirable, in addition to his frequent and detailed accounts of different countries. But it would certainly have found a more appropriate position, as the basis of his whole subsequent series of geographical notices, in the earlier portion of the text which treats of the great central nations of the world, Assyrians, Egyptians, and Persians, than in connexion with a remote and barbarous extremity. The more interesting facts which it supplies, — the circumnavigation of Libya by the Phœnician officers of Pharaoh Neco, the abortive attempt of Sataspis to perform the same voyage, and the navigation of Scylax from the mouth of the Indus to the Red sea, — connect themselves so obviously with the previous

[1] iv. 37. sqq.

descriptions of the Asiatic and African continents, that there is the more cause to wonder at the strange corner of his work into which Herodotus has thrust them.[1]

Among the episodes, of the familiar or popular order, which offend not so much by the impropriety of their position as by their frivolous character, a first rank belongs to the Egyptian legend of the Treasury of Rhampsinitus.[2] This story, while quite incompatible with the dignity of historical composition, even taking the term history in the wider sense which the public of Herodotus may have attached to it, occupies a still larger share of his chapter on Egypt than the very liberal one allotted to the national hero Sesostris. That the story is pure fable from beginning to end is evident; but it wants the merit which fables often possess of illustrating national character or manners. Even its Egyptian origin is questionable. It appears to belong to that primeval common fund of low romance, which, originating probably for the most part with

[1] See also the anecdote (III. 117.) of the damming up of the river Acis, by which Darius forced the inhabitants of several provinces to pay a heavy tax for the irrigation of their lands. What this story has to do with the previous long description of the treasures and wonders of the "Extremities" of the earth is not apparent. The notice of Demaratus's letter to the Spartans seems also quite out of place at the close of book VII. (§ 239.) where it now stands.

In noticing these anomalies, or others of a like nature that might be added, it must be remembered that the modern practice of foot-notes, marginal citations, and appendices, affords to authors facilities for rounding and polishing up their works, which were wanting in the days of Herodotus. The necessity under which the early classical writers lay, of either embodying their subordinate and illustrative details in their principal text, or omitting them altogether, obviously placed them under a disadvantage in their efforts to combine completeness with elegance in their compositions.

[2] II. 121. sqq.

nations of livelier imagination than the Egyptians, obtained a wide currency in the civilised antient world at a remote period; the particulars of time, place, and name being varied in each country[1] to suit the taste of its population. The amusement which the story is no doubt calculated to afford to the most fastidious in common with the less critical reader is of a kind which, even in the time of Herodotus, the Greek public would be more likely to seek in the pages of Æsop or Aristophanes than in those of a great national history. It arises solely from the absurdity of the adventures described, and the eccentricity of inventive humour which they exhibit, without a particle of true wit. Nor can it boast of any share of what would be in itself but a doubtful merit, that of didactic scope or moral application.

Another curious example of the shifts to which the historian occasionally resorts, to enliven the graver parts of his narrative, is to be found in his account of the march of Xerxes through Thessaly, where one of the emperor's country guides is introduced[2] entertaining his majesty on the road, with legends of local superstition as devoid of intrinsic value as of the slightest bearing on the general subject.

Concentration of the action on the affairs of Greece.

5. It is only in the earlier part of the history that the scheme of episodical enlargement on which it is framed involves any extensive breaches in the continuity of the narrative. The bulkier episodes, whether descriptive of the nations successively brought on the scene, or supplying notices of previous events,

[1] In Bœotia for example, and in Elis; Pausan. IX. 37.; Charax, ap. Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 508.

[2] VII. 197.

are comprised in the first half of the work. The early part of the fifth book forms the epic "middle," or turning point of the action. From thence downwards the narrative concentrates itself on the international rivalry of the Persians and Greeks; and steadily, though still by a somewhat circuitous path, advances towards the great hostile collision between the two races which forms the catastrophe. In the conduct of this portion of his subject the excellence of the historian's art more especially displays itself. The main scene of action was now to be changed from Asia to Europe. The part of protagonist was to be transferred from the Persians to the Greeks, or at least to be equally shared between the two nations. Those European Greek states, consequently, on whom the duty of sustaining that part was principally to devolve, were now to be drawn forth from the comparative obscurity in which they had hitherto been allowed to remain. Athens in particular, which had as yet lingered in the background, partly for the reason which the historian with appropriate solicitude presses on our attention, that her energies had been kept down by the tyranny of the Pisistratidæ, was now to appear as the life of the whole future action. Nothing can be happier than the mode in which this crisis is managed. The first step towards a serious collision between Persia and European Greece was the removal of that political estrangement which had long prevailed between the latter country and her Asiatic colonies. The more immediate cause of this result was the spirited but abortive attempt of the colonial states to reassert their independence, and the active sympathy which it called forth from the more generous portion of their kinsmen on the oppo-

site side of the Ægæan. The revolt takes place under the leadership of Miletus, a state bound to Athens by old ties of friendship. Athens herself, by another favourable link in the chain of coincidences, had, shortly before the outbreak, been emancipated from her political thraldom, and had taken up a new position of dignity and influence in the European confederacy. The notice of this change in her condition supplies also opportunity for some interesting details of the existing political relations among the Greek states.

The Pisistratidæ, when expelled from Athens, had settled in Asia minor, and under the patronage of Artaphernes satrap of Sardis continued to devise schemes for the reestablishment of their power at home. The Athenians remonstrate with Artaphernes; but he, not very courteously, declines to interfere. Precisely at this moment of irritation a mission arrives at Athens from the Milesians, soliciting aid to the cause of colonial independence. The request is granted, and an Athenian armament of twenty ships attacks and burns Sardis; an act, as the historian emphatically remarks[1], "pregnant with fatal consequences to Hellas." It occupies in fact, in his narrative, a place and influence closely parallel to the setting fire to the Greek camp by Hector in the Iliad. Events now succeed each other by a rapid train of cause and effect. The indignation of Darius at such an insult from what he considered so contemptible a quarter vents itself in two successive expeditions against Attica. The defeat of Marathon fans the flame of Persian irritation to fury; and is followed

[1] v. 97.

in the same continuous chain of consequences by the gorgeous armaments of Xerxes and their destruction at Salamis, Platæa, and Mycale.

Conclusion of the narrative: its merits,

Nor could the just epic conclusion of the narrative be better marked out than at the point selected by Herodotus. A more appropriate winding-up of the mighty series of vicissitudes could hardly be imagined than that supplied by the final return home of the victorious Athenian fleet from the Hellespont. By it the sea had now been swept of hostile galleys. The disasters of the haughty invader had been crowned by the ejection of his routed rearguard from their last strong hold on the shore of Europe; and among the trophies carried home by his conquerors, were the fragments of the bridge which had transported to that shore the millions collected for the subjugation of those who were now forcing him to drain the cup of humiliation to the very dregs.[1]

and defects.

Here again, however, in the close as in the previous course of his undertaking, the judgement of the historian appears rather in the general conduct of his subject than in the adjustment of its details. No where has his inveterate habit of anecdotal excursion been attended with worse effects, than at this important stage of his work where its dignity and propriety so imperatively required to be sustained. The long digression on the murders, adulteries, and incests of Xerxes and his family, inserted between the battle of Mycale and the final operations of the Greeks on the Hellespont, is lamentably out of place. While destructive of the just effect of the principal narrative, it loses the interest which, if

[1] See Appendix M.

more appositely introduced, it might have possessed as a picture of manners, and becomes simply offensive as a disgusting chapter of court scandal. Still more prejudicial in its way to the just consummation of a great historical work, is the absurd story of the fried fish which follows the taking of Sestus, and forms in fact the end of the narrative in the proper sense. The remaining purely episodical passage by which that end, as in the allegory of the snake biting its own tail, is so quaintly connected with the beginning, where Cyrus is described as having enjoined on his subjects to maintain their primitive simplicity of manners, seems to be intended as a sort of concluding moral commentary on the change in their character and fortunes since we parted with that monarch in the first book. If so, the moral is too obscurely inculcated to compensate by the matter for the clumsiness of the manner of its introduction.

Existing subdivision of the text.

None of the antient authors who quote Herodotus betray a knowledge of any other technical division of his text but that into nine books as we now possess it.[1] This fact certainly forms a historical argument in favour of the belief that the received mode is the original mode, and by consequence the one sanctioned by Herodotus, assuming the work to have been published by himself: for it is hardly to be supposed that any author would put forth a book of such bulk without some species of distribution into sections or chapters. There remains however to be considered the argument from internal evidence, which involves the following inquiries: how far the present distri-

[1] The earliest author who alludes to the division into Muses is Lucian: Herodotus, 1.; and De Conscrib. Histor. 42.

bution is either appropriate in itself or such as was likely to occur to Herodotus; and how far it may or may not be confirmed by the allusions contained in the text to the mode of its arrangement.

The existing mode, granting in any case the propriety of so bulky an allotment of parts, cannot on the whole be taxed with want of unity or consistency in those parts; although in some cases perhaps the points of subdivision might have been better selected. It seems however very doubtful whether any such system of comprehensive masses, embodying often each several well distinguished heads of subject, was likely to have suggested itself to Herodotus. The epic historian would probably have preferred a less arbitrary or artificial distribution, corresponding to the rhapsodies or cantos in which the narratives of the old epic bards were recited in his time, and into which they were supposed to have been arranged by their authors; and the term logos, used by him in referring to different heads of his subject, seems in fact to bear, in respect to prose composition, a signification parallel to that of rhapsody in epic poetry. The only example in the author's own text of a specific application of this term, is a passage of the fifth book[1] where he refers to a statement made in a former place as being in his first logos; which statement is found in § 92. of the present first book. We have thus his own evidence that some of his divisions of the text were of considerable bulk, for the one in question comprises about one half of the existing first book. But we have no evidence that any of them exceeded the limits of a natural logos or head of subject; the

[1] v. 36.

passage referred to being within the limits of what we are in the habit of designating his Lydiaca or Lydian history. From another text (VII. 93.), where a passage occurring in a subsequent part of the same first book (I. 171.) is described as "in one of the first logoi," it would also seem that the existing first book comprised more than one. A like inference may be drawn from his appeal in I. 75. to subsequent logoi which are supplied in I. 107. sqq.

Delineation of character.

6. We have had occasion to notice the disadvantage under which the historian of real events lies, as compared with the epic poet, in regard to the choice of his materials; that while the poet can select at pleasure from the stores either of fiction or reality, the historian is restricted to truth alone. In respect to delineation of character, the next most important attribute of each class of author, the historian, while under the same restriction, is not subject to the same disadvantage; for the realities of life in every age furnish as copious a supply of interesting varieties of human character as the imagination of the most gifted poet can call into existence.

Elaborate portraiture of character, even within the just limits of probability, is however the province of the poet rather than the historian. The selection of some remarkable personage as the centre of an important train of events, the studied delineation of his own qualities, and the working up of the events themselves in such a manner as to place his actions and influence in a prominent light, are among the most essential attributes of poetical art. The duty of the historian, on the other hand, is simply to represent both persons and events in their authentically recorded relation to each other; to allow consequently

his characters to exhibit themselves in as far as possible through the transactions in which they are engaged, without either prejudging their conduct or forestalling the judgements of his readers, by detailed commentaries on their virtues, defects, or peculiarities. In order to give to remarkable men that special prominence, both personal and historical, which is requisite to form a complete historical picture, he may, in the legitimate exercise of his discretion, give a similar prominence to transactions which tend to throw any vivid light on their characters, even when those transactions may not in themselves be of primary importance. But the practice of introducing elaborate descriptions of celebrated personages, often before their first entry on the scene, before consequently they have had any opportunity of speaking or acting for themselves, while one of the prominent characteristics is also one of the defects of the historical art of later times, and of the popular taste which sanctions it.

Of the three Greek historians of the best period whose works have survived, Herodotus is the one who has been most successful in this essential part of his office. His mode of protraiture, like that of his great model Homer, is exclusively dramatic. Thucydides and Xenophon, while resorting, and not always with the happiest effect, to the descriptive mode, have been far less successful than their distinguished predecessor in the art of making their heroes portray themselves.

This faculty in Herodotus, as in Homer, is displayed no less effectively in the case of nations than in that of individuals ; in distinguishing the genius of the Asiatic and European races, as in distinguish-

ing the character of individual kings, warriors, and statesmen. To the main features of the Persian character attention has been directed in another place; and but few supplementary remarks will here be required. The picture differs in its general design from that of the Greeks, in offering several distinct phases of the original subject. It may rather be called a succession of portraits, representing the rise, climax, and decline of the same nation. The Persians first appear as a primitive pastoral race, content with a local nationality under the supremacy of a kindred Asiatic people; but avail themselves of the first favourable opportunity to assert, in their turn, that ascendancy over their degenerate lords to which their hardy spirit seemed justly to entitle them. It is in this capacity of a young and vigorous people that they are represented as carrying into effect their scheme of conquest over the older members of the oriental body politic. But on obtaining possession of the dominion and wealth, they are rapidly infected with the social diseases of their predecessors; with luxury and pride; with blind confidence in their numbers and resources, and vainglorious contempt for those hardier neighbours by whom they are in their turn defeated and humbled. These stages of their career are finely shadowed forth in the characters of their four successive rulers, Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, and Xerxes, which offer, on the common foundation of an arbitrary spirit of despotism, well distinguished varieties of oriental royalty.

Persian emperors.

7. The first three sovereigns of the series were severally characterised by their own subjects, as Herodotus tells us, by the sobriquets of the Father, the

Cyrus. Despot, and the Huckster.[1] Cyrus accordingly appears in the historian's dramatic sketch as the model of a semibarbarous founder and conqueror. His energies, from his earliest youth, are devoted to the two main objects, of emancipating his countrymen from a state of vassalage, and extending their sway over foreign nations. Gifted by nature with a large share of political and military talent, and not devoid of literary culture, he displays the joint characteristics of the rude warrior and the paternal sovereign, in his anxiety to preserve his people from the enervating influence to which they are on all sides exposed, in his contempt for the higher civilisation of the conquered races, and in those ebullitions of petulance or caprice into which his generous but haughty temper occasionally effervesces. While restrained by no overscrupulous notions of equity or humanity in the pursuit of his ambitious projects, he is guilty of no act of wanton cruelty or injustice. Bred himself in the school of adversity, he shows a fellow-feeling for the misfortunes of others. He spares the life of Astyages, who had so diligently plotted his own death; and whose accumulated crimes might have justified a different treatment. His intended act of severity against Crœsus is also relieved by his subsequent generous treatment of that ill-starred monarch.

Cambyses. In Cambyses the same foundation of vigorous despotism bears a sadly inferior superstructure. Born to unlimited power and all its means of self-gratification, he is brutalised rather than enervated by the evil influences to which he is exposed. Without the refinement of a Nero, he rivals that type of inhuman

[1] III. 89.

tyrants in the magnitude and the method of his cruelties. His only redeeming qualities are martial enterprise, and a few sparks of innate generosity which gleam, though rarely, through his habitual course of outrage. He also shows himself, in the early part of his reign, not deficient in his father's political and military talents. But those talents, in the subsequent stages of his career, he is incapacitated from turning to account by a further inheritance of his parent's wayward impetuosity; which, after his conquest of Egypt, still further inflamed by habits of intoxication, finds vent in acts of phrensy, betokening, as the historian remarks, mental derangement rather than mere effervescence of temper. Such remnant of intellectual acuteness as he continued to enjoy exhibits itself in a vein of facetiousness, not devoid at times of wit, with which he seasons those sallies of jovial ferocity towards his family and courtiers that form his favourite diversion.[1] The

[1] When Crœsus, whom he had retained among other heir-looms of Cyrus about his person, ventured to reason with him on the dangers with which his murderous deeds might be pregnant to his own person and government, he asks in reply: "If it was the wisdom and success with which his Lydian Mentor had conducted the affairs of his own kingdom, that emboldened him to tutor other monarchs as to their proper course of conduct;" adding, that "he had long been anxious for an opportunity of ridding himself of so troublesome an attendant, and that he would not now let it slip." Whilst he was adjusting an arrow in his bow, which he always had by him ready for such emergencies, in order, with that unerring aim of which he was justly proud, to execute his threat, Crœsus escaped from the apartment. Cambyses ordered the guards to follow, seize, and kill him. Those officers, knowing their master's humour, and that he would speedily relent and again desire the company of the present object of his fury, preserved Crœsus alive under safe custody in the mean while. It happened as they expected: when Cambyses, on being informed that his friend was still living, expressed his gratification at the intelligence; but, observing at the same time that he could not allow so flagrant a violation of his orders to pass unpunished, he ordered the guards themselves to be put to death. III. 36.

apology of those who ascribed his more outrageous acts to madness rather than deliberate cruelty, seems to be justified by the ascendancy of better feelings which marks the closing scenes of his life, and is so beautifully described by the historian.[1]

Darius.

The life and reign of Darius present a new and more respectable specimen of Persian royalty. Indebted for his succession to the throne partly to birthright partly to his own sagacity, he unites the astute politician with the mercenary financier, or "huckster," as he was humorously nicknamed by his own subjects. His reign may be considered as the culminating point of Persian power and prosperity. His general policy was directed rather to the consolidation than the extension of his dominions, which are indebted to him for a system of internal organisation exhibiting statistical talents of a high order.[2] Although in early life a valiant and practised soldier, he shows no genius as a military commander, and less personal taste for military enterprise than either of his predecessors. His Scythian expedition, the only one led by himself, is ill planned, ill conducted, and humiliating in its results; and appears to have been undertaken, not so much perhaps from a thirst of martial glory, as from a sense of the obligation under which the successor of Cyrus and Cambyses lay, to maintain by some great achievement the lustre of the Persian arms. His acts of cruelty or oppression betray, not like those of Cambyses the wayward caprice of the pampered maniac, but the deliberate policy of the wary despot. His social habits and imperial establishment appear on a dignified footing of

[1] III. 64. sqq.

[2] III. 88. sqq.: conf. v. 52.

courtly ceremonial, of which there is little trace under Cyrus or his son; and all the forms of higher oriental civilisation and oriental luxury, involving the transition step to social corruption, are now fully developed.

His son Xerxes, as in the order of time, so in that of character and spirit, occupies the last and lowest grade of the four representatives of Persian royalty who figure in the historian's page. In the maniac ferocity of Cambyses there is yet a certain vigour and manliness which prevent our detestation of his crimes from being mingled with contempt. But Xerxes is the essence of a vainglorious, selfish, oriental tyrant, without the wisdom of Darius, the energy of Cyrus, or the courage and talent common to all three of his predecessors. His enterprise against Greece was instigated by no generous excess of national spirit or martial ardour, but was a weak and unwilling concession to the persuasion of ambitious and self-interested courtiers, backed by the influence of superstitious terrors.[1] But for these incitements, the magnitude of his empire and the splendour of his royal state would have sufficed for the demands of his vanity, and the undisturbed indulgence of his licentious pleasures at home was more to his taste than military achievement. When however the expedition is once decided on, the extravagance of the scale on which it is undertaken savours more of power-besotted imbecility than imperial ambition. The panic which seizes him on the first serious reverse of fortune, and his hurried flight, regardless of every consideration but his personal safety, stamp

Xerxes.

[1] VII. 5. sqq.

him as mean a coward as he had shown himself an incompetent commander. His single triumph at Thermopylæ is appropriately signalised by his brutal treatment of the body of Leonidas[1], and by the paltry trick with which he vainly attempted to blind his followers to the real circumstances of that battle.[2] The traits of private life added by the historian at the close of his narrative[3], exhibit a heartless cruelty and licentiousness which, combined with duplicity and infirmity of purpose, are more odious than the open enormities of Cambyses. The incidental touches by which the picture is finished off are the more effective from having been supplied, to all appearance, by no unfriendly hand. For Herodotus, if not actually indulgent to the vices of Xerxes, shows at least a disposition to enlarge on any little merit to which he could pretend. He praises[4] the beauty of his person, dwells on the anxiety felt by his subjects for his personal safety, and carefully records his magnanimous treatment of the Greek spies, and of the expiatory Spartan envoys.[5] But the ostentatious spirit displayed in these solitary acts of generosity prevents their inspiring respect. His vacillation in the council relative to his Greek expedition; his alternate boldness and timidity; his contumelious treatment of the faithful Artabanus in the morning, his deference to the sage's advice in the afternoon, and his reconversion at night in his dreams to his previous opinion[6], — are details which, though tending to place his character in a less and less favourable light, were not apparently so designed by Herodotus.

[1] VII. 238.
[2] VII. 187., VIII. 68.
[3] VIII. 24. sqq.
[4] IX. 108. sqq.
[5] VII. 136. 146.
[6] VII. 5. sqq.

Crœsus.

8. The most amiable specimen of an oriental monarch in Herodotus is Crœsus king of Lydia. But his character, though one of the most carefully delineated, is not certainly the most consistent or natural in the historian's page. In his early prosperous days he appears as an able and popular ruler, who had, partly by prudent policy partly by force of arms, extended the Lydian power over Asia minor. This he had effected without a single act of wanton cruelty or oppression; while many traits, both of his public and private conduct, which Herodotus has carefully and beautifully described, bespeak the warm affections of his heart and the generosity of his temper. His only serious defects are an almost puerile elation with his prosperity and wealth, and a presumptuous confidence in those precarious advantages: defects so pointedly and graphically portrayed by Herodotus, as to have established "Crœsus of Lydia" as their popular type in later times. The more improbable and unnatural is the sudden change which takes place in his character after the conquest of his kingdom. On the funeral pile he is himself at once converted from a Crœsus into a Solon; and comes forth from the fiery ordeal with a ready-made stock of moral maxims and sage reflexions on the duty of moderation, and with a contempt of the world and its vanities, such as would do honour to the profoundest philosopher trained from his youth in the school of adversity. In these, and other portions of the historian's work, may be discerned a large ingredient of that didactic effect which popular tradition, especially in the east, loves to impart to its anecdotes and to the characters of its heroes. There may be no reason to doubt the main fact of Cyrus having spared the life of Crœsus,

Common or conventional features of character.

and retained him on a friendly footing about his person. But it was also desirable to provide the Persian court with a professional Mentor and moralist; an appendage which appears, from other examples, to have been considered in the same didactic spirit as necessary to semibarbarous potentates. No more appropriate person for this office seems here to have offered himself than Crœsus, whose preparatory discipline in the school of philosophy, if not such as to satisfy the demands of probability, sufficed for those of an oriental imagination. This conventional spirit also appears in the assignment to different persons of the same traits of conduct or sentiment, the more effectually to individualise common traits of character. One example has been noticed[1], in the ignorance successively ascribed to Cyrus, Artaphernes, and Darius, of the name or existence of such people as the Athenians or Lacedæmonians; and in the almost identical terms in which the three rulers are made to ask information on the subject. The acts of atrocity by which Darius and Xerxes manifest their displeasure at any backwardness in their subjects to the duty of military service, are mere duplicates of each other.[2] The chastisement by Cyrus of the river Gyndes may also be compared with that inflicted by Xerxes on the waters of the Hellespont.[3]

Amasis.

We shall direct attention to one more among the non-Hellenic characters of Herodotus, that of Amasis king of Egypt[4], as a spirited variety of the historian's talent in the livelier department of ethic portraiture. There is here the less reason to doubt the genuine originality of the picture, that its main features,

[1] Ch. vi. p. 406. sq.
[2] IV. 84., VII. 39.
[3] I. 189., VII. 35.
[4] II. 161. sqq.

being so little in unison with those proper to the Egyptian nation, are the less likely to be fictitious or conventional; while the contrast between the eccentric vivacity of the sovereign and the grave formality of temper common to his subjects, has been well brought out in numerous skilful dramatic sketches. The character of this king, — the best and greatest of those authentically recorded to have sat on the throne of Egypt, under whom, as Herodotus tells us, the country reached its highest state of prosperity, without the occurrence of a single calamity during his forty-four years of reign [1], and by whom it was adorned with many of its noblest monuments, — is a combination of those of Henry IV. and Henry V. of England as dramatised by Shakspeare. Born a member of the military caste, but not of its aristocratic order, with good talents and humane disposition, but with little steady principle or sense of personal honour, Amasis appears in early life as a dashing young officer, of humorous temperament, ready wit, and dissolute habits, enjoying repute and popularity among his comrades in arms, with court favour and a place in the personal service of the reigning king Apries. When the Egyptians, offended by the misgovernment of that sovereign, rose against his authority, Amasis was sent to induce the troops that had joined the revolt to return to their allegiance. On arriving at their quarters, he is himself hailed as successor to the delinquent monarch. He shows himself nothing loth to submit to the honours thus forced upon him; and Herodotus gives a graphic account of his burlesque reception of the remonstrance sent to him by his

[1] III. 10.

master on his treacherous conduct.[1] After defeating and deposing Apries, he treats him kindly, and retains him in a friendly capacity about the court. When, in the sequel, the voice of the nation demanded that the unhappy ex-monarch should be put to death, Amasis declines all personal participation in such an act of severity, and washing his hands of the matter, delivers him over to the Egyptians to be dealt with as they saw fit. What follows is given in the historian's own words :[2]

"At first the Egyptian people made but little account of their new king, as being himself sprung from the ranks of the commonalty, and moreover from a family of no great distinction even in its own plebeian sphere. But he soon brought them to a better sense of their allegiance, not by harshness or intimidation, but by the influence of his conciliatory arts. Among other valuables of the royal household was a large gold trough, in which the king and his guests were in the habit of washing their feet. This vessel he caused to be melted down, and a statue of one of the favourite national deities to be fashioned out of it, and set up in a place of public resort. The image soon became an object of profound veneration to the Egyptians, who flocked in crowds to worship it. Amasis then called a public meeting, and explained to the people how this image had lately been one of his own most despicable articles of household furniture; that it had not only served himself and his friends as a foot-tub, into which they had been also in the habit of spitting and vomiting, but that it had even been used for still viler purposes on occasions of necessity. Yet this same base utensil had not the less become the object of their pious devotion. 'Now,' he added, 'my case is similar to that of the foot-tub. For, if I was formerly a man of mean estate, I am now your king, and it behoves you as my subjects to treat me with the honour due to my present position.' By this and other such pleasant devices he secured the cheerful obedience of his subjects. His ordinary habit of life was this. From sunrise till towards midday he devoted himself to the affairs of the state; but the whole after-

[1] II. 162. [2] II. 172. sqq.

noon he spent with his favourite attendants in conviviality and merrymaking, and even in boyish and frivolous pastimes. Some of his nobles took umbrage at this conduct and addressed him as follows: 'Sire, you do yourself injustice by demeaning yourself in this manner. It would better become you, who sit as lord upon a lordly throne, to apply the public hours of the day to public business. The Egyptians would then feel assured that they were governed by a truly great monarch, and would hold you in proper respect: but your present courses are not befitting your royal dignity.' To which he replied: 'Those who practise archery, when engaged in shooting keep their bows bent, but unstring them when their work is over; for were their weapons to be kept continually on the stretch, they would be in danger of breaking or becoming useless. As with bows, so it is with men. Those whose faculties are kept constantly in exercise, without an adequate allowance of sportive relaxation, run risk of mental derangement or bodily paralysis. It is my knowledge of this truth that induces me to devote an equal share of my time to pleasure and to business.' This king in his youth is said to have been a hard drinker, and a lover of practical jokes, and a man generally of loose moral habits. If, as would frequently happen, his funds for carrying on his revelries fell short, he was wont to replenish them by robbery; when those who believed him to have plundered them cited him, according to usage, before some neighbouring oracle; and in many instances the charge against him was sustained by the oracle, but in other cases he was acquitted. After he became king, he showed the greatest contempt for the deities by whose oracles he had been declared innocent of the robberies committed by him; neither performing sacrifice at their altars, nor bestowing gifts on their sanctuaries, but denouncing them as good for nothing gods, and authors of creditless decrees. But those by whom he had been convicted were treated by him with signal honours, as genuine divinities and infallible in their judgements."

It was natural that a monarch of such genial temperament and liberal ideas, should seek for amicable intercourse with nations of a character more in unison with his own than that of his countrymen. Herodotus, accordingly, describes in much detail the encouragement given by Amasis to the settlement

of Greeks in Egypt; also his alliances with leading Hellenic states in his own neighbourhood, Cyrene, Lindus, Samos; and his favourite sultana was a Cyrenian princess. His letter to Polycrates of Samos[1], in which he counsels that prince to season his overflowing cup of good fortune with a dash of self-inflicted adversity, lest some great reverse should overtake him, is, whether genuine or spurious, in good keeping with the character of the writer, and an appropriate addition to the other spirited traits with which Herodotus has embellished it.

Hellenic character.

9. The national genius of the Greeks offers, in the historian's page as in the reality, a marked contrast in almost every prominent feature to that of the Persians. The Hellenic body, while exhibiting in its integrity a vigorous and steadily progressive state of society, presents, in its separate members, a variety of intellectual and political phenomena as remarkable as the sameness which characterises the social system of the civilised Asiatic races. Any detailed commentary on a topic so familiar as the Greek national character, and which connects itself but incidentally with our proper subject, were here out of place. A few remarks, however, will be desirable on the historian's comparative picture of the two leading members of the confederacy, the Athenians and Lacedæmonians, as being, both in an ethic and a literary point of view, one of the most excellent specimens of his art.

The Athenians.

Attention has already been directed, in treating of the imputed partialities of Herodotus, to several of the more excellent points in the character of the Athe-

[1] III. 40.

nians; to their steady patriotism, heroic endurance of the calamities it entailed on them, and untarnished military prowess; virtues which induced the historian[1] to award them, above all their countrymen, the proud distinction of saviours of Hellas in her late emergency. Their patriotic disinterestedness is perhaps the most admirable trait of the whole, and supplies Herodotus with many interesting descriptions. Throughout the war, those considerations of individual dignity and precedence, to which so great and often fatal an importance is apt to be attached by rival members of a confederate body, seem to have been thrown aside by Athens altogether. The claims which she, most reasonably, advanced to the posts of honour in the council or the field, are cheerfully abandoned on every occasion where an adherence to them seemed likely to endanger the union essential to the success of the common cause.[2]

Their disinterested patriotism.

Another agreeable trait of this youthful phasis of the Attic character is the candid openness and publicity displayed by the state in her political dealings, so different from the Macchiavellian reserve of Spartan diplomacy. This characteristic was in some degree a consequence of her now firmly established free constitution; but at this early stage of the democracy it displays itself in a genial simplicity of form very different from the clamorous license of the age of Cleon. It appears also the more remarkable from its contrast to the opposite qualities in the individual

Their candour.

[1] VII. 139., VIII. 3.

[2] VIII. 2. sqq., IX. 26, 27. This feature displays itself not only in the dealings of the republic with rival states, but in those of her own leading citizens with each other. A very striking example is the cession by the other strategi of their turns of command to Miltiades at the battle of Marathon. VI. 110.

Athenian officers, who, when vested with discretional powers, show themselves at least on a par with those of other Greek states in talents for intrigue and in readiness to turn them to account. Themistocles, in particular, surpasses all the contemporary statesmen in the audacity and ingenuity of his manœuvres.

Their humanity.

Herodotus has also well appreciated and graphically depicted that engaging element of the Attic character which we shall designate its Humanity; the term being here used in the widest sense, as indicating not only a benevolence of temper and manners, but the possession of those qualities which in every age constitute the accomplished gentleman and man of the world. Many lively ethic sketches and pleasant anecdotes show that in these qualifications the Athenians had already, at this early period of Greek polite culture, taken that foremost rank which they afterwards maintained in civilised Europe. One of the most characteristic of these anecdotes, and not the less so from the probability that its details may be fabulous, is that describing how the prompt and courteous hospitality shown by the elder Miltiades to a company of unknown travellers, procured him the sovereignty of an extensive territory. The inhabitants of the Thracian Chersonesus, hard pressed in a war with powerful neighbours, sent three of their chiefs to ask advice and relief from the Delphic oracle. The Pythoness instructed them to select as the restorer of their fortunes the man who, on their journey after leaving the sanctuary, should first invite them to partake of his hospitality. After traversing Phocis and Bœotia, without obtaining any opportunity of acting on this instruction, they crossed over into Attica, and passing along the road in front

of the house of Miltiades, were hailed by the proprietor, invited in, and honourably entertained. In the sequel he accedes to the overtures of his guests, sets out with a body of adventurous fellow-citizens, and on arrival in his new sphere of action is invested with the royal dignity.[1] Whatever element of fact this story may contain, a main object of its details is evidently to exhibit the humanity of the Athenians in favourable contrast to the boorishness of their neighbours beyond Cithæron.

In the historian's account[2] of the competition for the hand of the daughter and heiress of Clisthenes, tyrant of Sicyon, the two most accomplished of the numerous band of suitors, comprising the cream of Hellenic chivalry, who flocked to the court of her father, were Athenians. The genius of the usurper Pisistratus also reflects, still more forcibly perhaps than that of more patriotic citizens, this agreeable characteristic of the race whom he kept in subjection. The many admirable qualities which he combines with his political failings, and which cause him to stand forth among his fellow-despots, Periander, Thrasybulus, and Polycrates, as by far the most favourable specimen of his order, may all be comprised under the single designation of his humanity.

Their levity.

The chief defect of the Attic character, also illustrated by many lively sketches of Herodotus, the same defect for which in every age it remained conspicuous, is its Levity. He ridicules their fickleness, in one day chasing the tyrant from their city, and the next receiving him with open arms and rescating him on his throne; and the facility and credulity

[1] VI. 34. sq.

[2] VI. 127. sqq.

with which they became the dupes of the stratagems he employed to sway them to his purpose, stratagems that might be called puerile had they not proved successful.[1] Equally characteristic is his account of the mode in which Hippoclides, in the hall of Clisthenes of Sicyon, danced away the richest bride in Greece; and of his celebrated retort, pronouncing that even such a prize would be dearly purchased at the cost of half an hour's restraint on the exuberance of his Attic vivacity.[2] The generous but impolitic readiness of the Athenians to support Aristagoras in his ill-concerted revolt against Darius, as compared with the wary callousness of the Lacedæmonians on the same occasion, is sarcastically adduced as proof how much easier it is to impose on the government of the many than of the few.[3] The unexplained suddenness with which they afterwards sailed home, leaving the Ionians to their fate, after a desultory exploit which did more to injure than promote the patriotic cause, is also as little creditable to their good sense as to their good faith. It is finely contrasted in the sequel with the remorse of conscience and revulsion of feeling displayed by the assembled citizens in the theatre, when the sad fate of their antient ally Miletus, for which they must have held themselves partly responsible, was so powerfully and pathetically brought

[1] I. 59, 60.

[2] VI. 129. Mr. Grote, we observe with some surprise (Hist. of Gr. vol. III. p. 53.), characterises this exploit of Hippoclides as a "drunken freak;" an expression, which seems at once to degrade a brilliant ebullition of Athenian "étourderie" to the level of an English pot-house brawl. It is only by some such standard of interpretation that the phrase προϊούσης τῆς πόσιος could ever be imagined to bear the construction put on it by Mr. Grote. The feat itself was one which no drunken man could ever by any possibility have performed.

[3] V. 97. sqq.

home by the drama of Phrynichus to their sympathies.[1] Their inconsiderate folly in placing seventy ships at the uncontrolled disposal of Miltiades, to be employed in an expedition of the nature of which the government was left in utter ignorance, is both convicted and punished by the disgraceful issue of the enterprise.[2] An impartial tribunal would have imposed on the citizens themselves a large share of the severe penalties afterwards exacted by them from the illustrious victim of his own and their folly.

One is naturally led to ask how this habitual levity and inconsistency should have suddenly given place, on the invasion of Xerxes, to as remarkable a unity and constancy of counsels and action. Such anomalies are however familiar in every age of the world. The same excess of vivacity, which in ordinary times finds vent in trifles or follies, would seem, as concentrated in seasons of great emergency on nobler objects, to be what renders a nation equal to the mightiest efforts. The Athenians among the antients, and the French in our own day, offer parallel illustrations of this phenomenon.

Spartans.

10. In regard to almost every feature above noticed, the character of the Spartans is represented by Herodotus, and with equal dramatic effect, as the opposite of that of the Athenians. The only qualities possessed in common by the two nations are their patriotism and their valour. But the modes in which these qualities are exhibited in each are so different, as to render even here the distinction more striking than the correspondence. The patriotism of the Lacedæmonians, like their entire policy, is systemati-

Their Macchia-

[1] VI. 21.

[2] VI. 133.

vellian selfishness.

cally selfish. That of the Athenians is generously and unreflectingly panhellenic. The all-engrossing objects of Sparta are to preserve her own independence and extend her own influence; and Herodotus leaves it very doubtful whether, could those objects have been best secured by an abandonment of the rest of Greece to the Persian invader, she would have made any great effort for its preservation. Her policy was, at the utmost, so to defend Hellas as to weaken those members of the confederacy whom she considered her rivals. Accordingly, the treacherous breach of her engagement with Athens[1] to make the northern Attic frontier, as a common line of defence, the basis of their strategic operations, involves at least a temporary annihilation of the rival republic. When there appeared any danger that Athens, in the extremity to which she was reduced by the treachery of her Dorian confederate, might resort to the desperate course of either withdrawing from the contest or siding with the Persians, the Spartans were ever ready, by promises and cajolery, to encourage her to persevere. But no sooner was the immediate emergency provided for, than promises were forgotten and the ally was left to her fate. "I know no reason," says the historian, "why the Lacedæmonians, who had exerted themselves so strenuously to prevent Athens from making terms with the Persians, at the time when Mardonius sent Alexander with proposals to that effect, should a few weeks afterwards have shown themselves so entirely indifferent as to what course the Athenians might pursue, unless it was, that the lines of fortification which they had been

[1] IX. 7.

busily constructing across the Isthmus were now finished, whereas at the time of Alexander's mission they were still incomplete."[1] Even when doing what was right, they seem to have preferred doing it in an underhand manner. Of this gratuitous duplicity the historian gives a curious example in the portion of the text immediately following that just quoted.

This selfish spirit, masked under an outward show of love of liberty, displays itself at every period of Spartan history, and is keenly and cleverly satirised by Herodotus from time to time. In tracing the remoter causes of the quarrel between Greek and Barbarian, he tells us that "Crœsus reduced all the Greek states in his own neighbourhood to subjection, but formed a friendly alliance with Lacedæmon."[2] The antithesis in the first and second clauses of this statement is a plain sarcasm on the indifference of Sparta to Hellenic liberty when her own interests were safe. His further intimation[3], that she was partly induced to accept the Lydian conqueror's offer of alliance by a rich present of gold lately sent her as material for a statue of Apollo, is also not without its ethic meaning. No less significant is his account of their prompt refusal to aid the Asiatic Hellenes in asserting their freedom against Cyrus, followed up by the empty bravado addressed to that monarch: "that they would put up with no act of aggression against the states of European Greece."[4] The single act of political liberality for which Herodotus gives them credit, their cooperation with the Attic patriots in expelling the usurper Hippias, is also described as not voluntarily performed, but as forced on them by

[1] IX. 8. [2] I. 6. [3] I. 69. [4] I. 152.

the Pythoness, bribed by the Alcmæonidæ to espouse the cause of Attic liberty.[1] It was on the discovery of the trick by which they had been entrapped into a line of policy so contrary to their sense of their own interests, that they proposed[2] in the Dorian council of war the project of reestablishing the tyrant Hippias in his authority; a project scornfully and unanimously rejected even by that assembly. Other examples of this combined spirit of selfishness and duplicity have been given in the previous chapter.[3]

The boorishness of the Spartan social habits, as contrasted with the genial humanity of Athens, was probably too familiar in the time of Herodotus to afford much scope for novelty of description. It forms accordingly the subject of but a few incidental though graphic touches.

Their military prowess.

This severity against the prevailing defects of Sparta, with the warm eulogies bestowed on the opposite virtues of Athens, may naturally awaken suspicions of exaggeration in the one case or of undue partiality in the other. But an antidote to any such suspicion is to be found, first in the historian's forwardness, on all occasions, to do justice to individual acts of heroism on the part of Lacedæmonian warriors or statesmen; secondly, in the unqualified admiration which he every where expresses for that feature of the Spartan character which the Spartans themselves regarded as its primary excellence, and which with the public of every age has constituted their chief claim to celebrity,—their martial prowess. Upon all occasions this quality forms the subject of his warmest eulogy. Here indeed the admirers of Athens might

[1] v. 63. sq. [2] v. 91. sq. [3] In fine.

find reasonable ground for reversing the charge of favouritism, and for maintaining that Herodotus, under the influence of that habitual deference with which the pretensions of Sparta to unrivalled military virtue were then treated by the Hellenic body at large, has been led to underrate the claims of others to equal or surpass her. We have already noticed[1] the unfair prominence given by the historian to Leonidas and his Spartans over the other warriors who fell at Thermopylæ. The chief merit, if merit it be, of the Spartan commander above his fellow-victims, is that of having suggested the common act of self-sacrifice. The devotion of the three hundred Lacedæmonians, men trained, or rather constrained from their childhood, by an inexorable system of military ascetism, and under cruel penalties in case of failure, to such desperate acts, as matters not so much of extraordinary heroism as of ordinary duty, is not worthy to be compared with that of the seven hundred Thespians, who, subject to no such training, and to no terror of opprobrious penalties, undertook the fatal service with equal alacrity. Yet the bare fact of the Thespians having so acted is all that Herodotus says concerning them! All comment or eulogy is reserved for Leonidas and his Spartiates; whose good sayings on the occasion are recorded, whose military toilets and gymnastic exercises are described, with a parade which, instead of further embellishing, rather imparts a tinge of affectation to the brilliancy of the exploit. And how few are there of the millions who have heard or read of the battle of Thermopylæ, in whose minds the achievement is associated with any other idea than that of Spartan heroism; or who are aware

[1] p. 418.

that the Spartans were in the proportion of less than one half of the Thespians, and the Spartans and Thespians united in the proportion of but one third of the poor Helots who fell on that memorable occasion.[1]

Nor is it apparent by what equitable rule of judgement the palm of military excellence was awarded, with the implied approbation of Herodotus, to the Lacedæmonians rather than the Athenians at the battle of Platæa; for in the historian's own narrative, the conduct of the Athenians appears, in all the more important points of military virtue decidedly superior.[2]

Anti-Attic feeling of the confederacy.

It may seem difficult to reconcile the many signal excellences of Athens, as described by Herodotus, with the marked ill-will entertained towards her by the great body of her fellow-states. Among other modes in which this feeling shows itself, is their strong disinclination to concede to the Athenians in form, the privilege which they exercised in fact, of commanding in chief the naval portion of the national armament. To that honour they possessed every claim, in right of their great superiority of naval force, and the greater ability and experience of their admirals; distinguished as they also were by a disin-

[1] In the face of a popular prejudice of some 2300 years, we do not hesitate to assert, that the merits of this celebrated exploit, as described by Herodotus, have been greatly overrated. Reason and judgement are as necessary ingredients of true valour as of every other human virtue. So long as the stand made at the Pass was a real defence, it was a glorious military action. But when it became no longer a defence, but a wanton sacrifice of a body of Greek citizens whose duty it should have been to keep their services for the common country in the subsequent stages of her present emergency, it became little more than a vainglorious display of Spartan military desperation. The prowess of the Athenians at Marathon is as superior to that of the Sparto-Thespians at Thermopylæ, as the courage of a man who bravely struggles against the evils of life is to that of him who commits suicide the better to show his contempt for them.

[2] See Appendix N.

terested patriotism, so much more likely to insure an impartial exercise of their office than the selfish intriguing of the Spartans. Not only however was a preference given to the claims of the latter state, but the great body of the confederacy refused to serve at all under Athenian command. Herodotus assigns no reason for this strong anti-Attic prejudice; possibly from a belief that the true reason would occur to his more discerning readers. The confederacy had become habituated to look to Sparta as its leading state; the ascendancy of that republic, especially in military affairs, being now of antient date. Athens had but recently emerged from mediocrity, and her former equals were animated towards her by a natural spirit of jealousy. But apart from this, the greater number of states leagued against Xerxes were Dorians; and Sparta was the recognised chief of the Dorian as distinct from the Ionian section of the nation. Athens, on the other hand, as the leader of the Ionian section, had at present no followers; the great body of Ionian states, in the islands and colonies, being constrained to fight in the ranks of the enemy. On the emancipation however of these colonies from the Persian yoke, their adherence to the Athenian interest speedily transferred from Sparta to Athens the leadership of the maritime power of Greece. It is remarkable that Herodotus, in his prospective allusion to this change, seems to have quite misapprehended its real motive. He ascribes it[1] merely to a change of feeling on the part of the same states that had formerly repudiated Attic influence; the fact being that those states remained as

[1] VIII. 3.

much estranged as ever from Athens. The revolution was brought about, as Thucydides more clearly saw, by the Ionian republics of Asia and the Ægæan isles.[1]

Individual Greek characters.

11. The historian's portraiture of individual Greek character offers but a narrow field for critical commentary. The little prominence given to Hellenic affairs in the early part of his narrative admitted of proportionally little being assigned to Greek warriors and statesmen; and the lives of those who take a lead in the later vicissitudes of Hellenic history, Pausanias for example and Themistocles, fall but in part within the limits of his own narrative. Themistocles indeed is made the subject of a spirited sketch; but one which remains imperfect; and the more so that the unfinished part would have comprised the less prosperous period of his life. The details given supply a series of appropriate illustrations of the concise summary of his qualities transmitted by Thucydides.[2] "He was distinguished," says that historian, "above all other men, for the vigorous exercise of a naturally vigorous understanding; for the talent of deciding on the spur of the moment, and with the least aid from previous knowledge or present reflexion, on the course to be taken in any pressing emergency; and for turning the experience of the past to account in prognosticating or providing for the future. To sum up his character in a few words, he may be pronounced the man of his age most remarkable for the extent and variety of his intellectual powers; for fertility in expedients; for rapidity and sagacity in choosing the wisest measures, and energy and success

Themistocles.

[1] I. 95. [2] I. 138.

in carrying them into effect." This graphic and elegant description has however the signal defect of being limited to his intellectual faculties. His moral qualities good or bad; his combination of warm patriotism with lax public principle; his indifference to all considerations of personal pride or pecuniary interest where his country's welfare was seriously at stake, with his readiness at other times to adopt the most nefarious shifts to aggrandise or enrich himself; his thorough command of all the arts of intrigue, and his unscrupulous piracy, where opportunity offered, of the credit due to the ingenious devices of others; these, constituting as they do, the most curious traits of his strangely compounded character, have been overlooked by Thucydides, but supply Herodotus with a fertile fund of lively anecdote.[1]

Cleomenes.

The only Spartan character portrayed at much detail is that of king Cleomenes. It is little more than a counterpart of that of Cambyses; with this difference, that while it combines falsehood and low cunning with the maniac ferocity for which both worthies are distinguished, it wants even the small ingredient of generosity which relieves, in however slight a degree, the vices of the son of Cyrus.

Periander.

The historian's notices of Periander of Corinth present, as formerly observed[2], anomalies justifying the belief that it embodies, not so much the result of his own impartial research as the calumnies of the then popular party in the Corinthian state, in whose traditions he has been led, from whatever cause, to repose too implicit a confidence. That party appears, whether from personal spleen or from a zealous desire

[1] VIII. 4. sqq. 58. 109—112.

[2] Vol. III. p. 384. sqq.: conf. supra, p. 391. sqq.

to keep alive the public feeling against tyrannical government, to have done their best to blacken the memory of a ruler under whom their country had enjoyed a prosperity and power which their own policy had not been able to maintain. No attempt is made to explain how a prince, guilty at home of the monstrous acts of cruelty and iniquity imputed to him by Herodotus, should yet have established so high a reputation abroad for wisdom and justice, as to have been appointed sole arbiter in a dispute between the rival states of Athens and Mitylene, and to have, by his award, brought to a close the series of bitter hostilities in which they had for many years been embroiled. No attempt is made to explain how a husband who had wantonly murdered an innocent and affectionate wife, should have shown himself so fondly indulgent a father, or should have manifested so singular a forbearance towards the insulting caprices of a disobedient son. Nor is it easy to understand how such a character as the Periander of Herodotus should have obtained a place in Aristotle's list of the Seven sages. It would also have been well had the sweeping accusation brought against the "tyrant," of having destroyed or banished the leading citizens of Corinth, been substantiated by the mention of a few particulars of name or circumstance. The discrepancy of the modes in which the graver charges against Periander have been shaped by different authorities, and the absurdity of most of their details, also shed an air of both fable and calumny over this whole chapter of scandalous biography.

In passing on to the several branches of subject comprised under the head of the Style of Herodotus, attention is first called to the dramatic element of

his composition, as more immediately connected with the subject illustrated in the preceding pages.

Dramatic element of the historian's style.

12 The term Dramatic, as applied to the conduct of a historical narrative, signifies, first, the introduction of notable personages speaking as well as acting for themselves, rather than by the agency of their historian; and secondly, the art of making them express themselves naturally and in language adapted to their characters.

The verbal intercourse of men actively engaged in public life may be carried on in every age, and was extensively carried on in the age of Herodotus, in two modes: first, by confidential or familiar dialogue; secondly, by set speeches delivered on formal occasions. As it is not credible that the actual words spoken by persons engaged in such dialogues or debates could, unless in rare instances, be recorded with precision, it follows that the speeches and conversations reported in the work of Herodotus, or any work of its class, although they may in some cases represent in substance the sentiments of the speakers, are, with few if any exceptions, fictitious in their existing form and details. Their introduction is therefore, strictly speaking, a breach of that close adherence to truth which constitutes the essential characteristic of history as distinct from poetry or fable. But although this practice may not be consistent with the strict laws of historical art, the violation of them which it involves is one so natural and venial, that unless when carried to an unreasonable excess it seems never to have been noticed as a defect by the antient critics, habituated to it as they were from the infancy of their literature; while the charm which, in skilful hands, it imparts to the uniformity

of purely exegetic style, reconciles it even to the fastidiously critical sense of the modern reader.

This much indulgence being conceded to the practice, as at the best a license in historical composition, the conditions under which it may yet be made to conduce to the spirit and effect of a narrative reduce themselves very much to this fundamental one: that the words placed in the mouth of each person should be so well adapted to his character, and flow in so easy and natural a stream, as to make the reader forget that they are the words of the historian, and promote the illusion that they are those of the speaker. Prolonged or studied orations consequently, unless where intentionally placed in the mouths of professional orators or sophists, must, as tending to dispel such illusion, have the effect of encumbering rather than enlivening the course of the narrative.

The efforts of Herodotus to impart dramatic effect to the discourses of his actors, if not invariably successful, have been far more generally so than those of any other classical historian. The characters of Thucydides, when allowed to speak for themselves, speak solely in the capacity of orators or dialecticians; and the number, length, and rhetorical subtlety of their harangues form the grand defect of his work, whether in regard to its historical truth or its narrative style. His eight books offer no interchange of what can properly be called dialogue. His action consequently remains devoid of genuine dramatic spirit. The orations of Xenophon, although the rhetorical element is in them also too much in the ascendant, are less laboured and artificial. But the dialogues in which, like Herodotus, he frequently indulges, are seldom distinguished for propriety or

spirit, and are apt to degenerate into insipid conversational common-place.

Speeches.

The practice of introducing set speeches in historical narrative is probably as old as prose history; but owing to the loss of the integral texts of the historians prior to Herodotus, we are unable to judge to what extent it may have existed before his time. It was partly borrowed from the usage of the epic poets, by which in various respects that of the early logographers was guided; and was, besides, naturally suggested by the prevalence of public oratory in every department of Greek social and political life; a peculiarity, the general influence of which, in imparting a rhetorical tone to prose style, has been noticed in a previous chapter. Herodotus evidently participated to but a limited degree in the taste of his age for rhetorical display. Set orations are rare in his text. Even on more formal occasions, the addresses of his actors more frequently assume the character of debate or discussion than of declamatory harangue. At times they embody episodical narratives, similar to those of Nestor or Phœnix in the Iliad. Such is the speech of the Corinthian Sosicles in the Dorian council at Sparta, narrating the past vicissitudes of his native republic.[1] The only orations of a strictly rhetorical character in the historian's work, are those of the Persian chiefs in the council of Seven[2]; those spoken in the cabinet of Xerxes, in the discussion of his project of invading Greece[3]; and the appeal of Aristagoras to Cleomenes[4] for aid in his revolt against Darius. The harangues delivered on the first-mentioned occasion

[1] v. 92. [2] III. 80. sqq. [3] VII. 8. sqq. [4] v. 49.

are among the most objectionable passages of the historian's work. Persons are introduced discussing, in language and with arguments foreign to all their habits of thought, questions the very existence of which had never probably entered their heads. Herodotus seems to be here suddenly possessed with the spirit of Gorgias or Prodicus; a spirit to the fascinating influence of which he was daily exposed, but has never fortunately except on the present occasion altogether succumbed. The idea of such a discussion originated probably with some sophist of the Siculo-Attic school, to whom the legend of a deliberation having been held by the Seven conspirators as to the disposal of the Persian crown, might suggest itself as a basis on which to discuss in dialectic style the relative merits of the three fundamental forms of civil government; just as Xenophon afterwards made the "Education of Cyrus" the basis of a theory as to the course of training best adapted to form an accomplished monarch.

Dialogue.

13. The dialogue, in the proper sense of the term, is one of the modes in which the historian's fine taste and powers of composition are most agreeably exhibited. Of the extent to which he has employed this mode of management few readers probably become aware in the ordinary perusal of his work; and this is one of the proofs of the excellence of his method. So easy is the transition from the narrative to the colloquial form, and so natural the manner in which the speakers acquit themselves, that we are scarcely conscious of having passed from the one style to the other. A closer analysis however of the text shows that it may with nearly equal justice be said of Herodotus, as was said by Aristotle of Homer, "that he

seldom undertakes the office of speaking for others where they can with propriety be allowed to speak for themselves; but is careful, after a brief preamble of his own, to introduce his characters transacting their own affairs in their own words." This remark is verified in the opening chapter of his work. The introductory notices of primeval history are given rapidly and concisely in his own language; but the moment he enters on his main subject, commencing with the adventure of Gyges and Candaules, he transfers to those two personages the duty hitherto performed by himself. The same method is followed in his histories of Crœsus and Cyrus, and on almost every appropriate occasion in the sequel of his narrative.

This faculty of combining in an effective manner the colloquial with the exegetic appears, in prose history as in poetry, to be a privilege of the earlier stages of the art of composition. Herodotus may, consequently, in this respect, as in others previously noticed, be considered as a man of the "olden time" rather than of that in which he lived; being the only extant Greek historian whose efforts in this department have been really successful. It is a faculty which, like other characteristics of primitive art, maintains its youthful vigour and its popularity in the humbler walks of narrative composition, as for example in the books of the New Testament, long after it is extinct in the higher circles of the literary republic. A specimen from Herodotus has already been given in our illustration of the character of Amasis. Another is here subjoined from the episode of the death of Atys. The analogy between the dramatic style of the clas-

sical, and that of the sacred historians, will not escape the critical reader:

"The Mysian envoys, on arriving at the court of Crœsus, addressed him in these words: 'O king, a wild boar of great size and ferocity has appeared in our province and ravages our lands; and all our efforts to destroy him have been in vain. We now therefore entreat thee to send thy son, with a chosen band of Lydian youths, to aid us in killing this fierce enemy or driving him out of our country.' Such was their request. But Crœsus, bearing in mind his dream, answered them as follows: 'Concerning my son take no more thought, for he is but newly married, and engaged with other matters. But I will send you all my most skilful huntsmen, with their dogs and best equipment, and with orders to exert themselves to the utmost to rid your province of this destructive animal.' On the departure of the Mysians, well pleased with their reception, the young prince, already apprised of the object of their visit, came in; and on learning how their request that he should lead the expedition had been denied, he thus addressed his father: 'Sir, it was formerly our ambition and our pride that I should be foremost in all warlike enterprises or hazardous adventures. But thou hast now debarred me from such honourable pursuits, without having any charge either of timidity or incapacity to urge against me. With what face then shall I in future show myself in public among the citizens? or in what light shall I appear in their eyes or in those of my young spouse? and to what manner of man will she consider herself to have been united? I beseech thee, therefore, either to permit me to join this hunting party, or to show some good cause for keeping me at home.' To which Crœsus replied: 'My son, it is not from observing in thee either timidity or any other defect that I am led to take this course, but from having been warned in a dream that thy life will be short, and that thou art doomed to perish by a steel-pointed weapon. It was that vision which caused me to hasten on thy marriage, and now induces me to restrain thee from a share in this adventure; if by any means I might succeëd in preserving thee alive, at least during my own lifetime. Since thou art in truth my only son; for thy brother being, as thou knowest, deprived of both speech and hearing, is to me as if he were not.' 'My father,' rejoined the prince, 'it is but reasonable that, having seen such a vision, thou shouldest keep a careful watch over thy

son; but I will make bold to point out wherein thou hast failed to apprehend the spirit of thy dream. Thou sayest that by it thou hast been forewarned that I should perish by a steel-pointed weapon. But where are now the hands, or where the sword or javelin of which thou shouldest be afraid? Had thy vision foretold that I was to meet my death by a wound of a tusk or a tooth, thou mightest then well resort to this measure of precaution. But it is not against these, but against the pointed steel that thou art forewarned. I pray thee therefore restrain me not.' To which Crœsus: 'My son, I acknowledge thy interpretation of my dream to be more just than my own. Being therefore convinced by thy arguments, I yield also to thy wishes; and grant thee permission to go forth to the boar-hunt.'" [1]

The historian's descriptive powers.

14. The historian's powers of description fall no way short of those displayed by him in the dramatic department of composition. He places each object or event before us in the same effective manner, and with the same freedom from effort, which distinguish his mode of imparting speech to his characters. His scenes of the tragic order are worked up with a combination of simplicity and power rare in Greek literature beyond the page of Homer. Such passages occur chiefly in the earlier part of the narrative, the materials of which have more of the legendary character favourable to poetical treatment. The volume of popular romance contains few more beautifully told tales than that of the death of Atys; of the desperate grief of its involuntary author, the generous treatment experienced by him from the bereaved father, and his own self-inflicted punishment. Other fine descriptions of the same pathetic order are the account of the filial piety and death of Cleobis and Biton [2], and that of the scene in front of the gate of Memphis after the conquest of Egypt. The latter is here sub-

[1] I. 36. sqq. [2] I. 31.

joined as a characteristic and not over long specimen of the historian's tragic style of poetical anecdote:[1]

"On the tenth day after the taking of Memphis, Cambyses caused king Psammenitus, attended by his Egyptian nobles, to be led out and seated before the city gate. He then directed that the daughter of the king, with other virgins of rank, habited as slaves and bearing waterpots, should be sent forth that way to draw water from the fountain. As the maidens passed along weeping and lamenting before their parents, the other fathers, seeing their children thus cruelly degraded, also lifted up their voices and wept: Psammenitus alone, on recognising his daughter, fixed his eyes silently and steadily on the ground. After the damsels came the king's son, followed by two thousand noble youths of his own age, each with a halter round his neck and a bridle in his mouth, led out to suffer death, as an atonement for the massacre, by the Egyptians, of the two hundred men of the Mitylenæan ship sent with terms of submission by Cambyses. Here again the companions of Psammenitus renewed their tears and lamentations: but the king maintained unmoved his previous attitude and demeanour. When the young men were also gone by, it happened that a former friend and boon-companion of Psammenitus, an aged man, who had fallen into so low a state of poverty as to be obliged to beg for his subsistence, passed through the crowd asking alms of the soldiers. No sooner had Psammenitus recognised his antient comrade in this condition, than starting up, and calling to him by name, he smote his forehead burst into tears and wept aloud. Cambyses, on being informed of this by his officers, who had orders to report all that took place on the occasion, wondering greatly, sent a messenger who thus addressed Psammenitus: 'King Cambyses would know of thee, O Psammenitus, why, on seeing thy daughter degraded to the condition of a slave, and thy son led out to be put to death, thou hast neither wept nor cried aloud, and yet hast taken so deeply to heart the lot of this old mendicant, who, as my lord is informed, is not even of thine own kindred.' To this Psammenitus replied: 'Son of Cyrus, my own domestic calamities are far greater and heavier than that I should weep for them; but I could not restrain my tears on seeing the friend, whom I once knew wealthy and prosperous, reduced in extreme old age to beg

[1] III. 14.

his bread.' With this reply Cambyses was well pleased; and the Egyptians add that Crœsus, who was present, having accompanied the king on his expedition, shed tears, as did also the Persians who stood around; and that even Cambyses was touched with compassion, and sent one with orders to spare the life of the king's son, and bring him back to the city. But it was too late, for the messenger on arriving at the place of execution found that the young prince had been the first to suffer."

As examples of the mixed ethic and tragic style may be cited, the legend of the birth and youth of Cyrus[1]; the quarrel between Periander and his son Lycophron[2]; and Arion's adventure with the dolphin.[3] The historian's power of working up the grotesquely sublime is displayed in his account of the funeral rites of the Scythian kings[4]; his conception of the sublime apart from the grotesque, in his description of the death of Prexaspis. When the Median Magus Smerdis, in the assumed character of Smerdis brother of Cambyses, had usurped the Persian throne, he and his accomplice brother Patizithes endeavoured to gain over to their interests Prexaspis the confidential officer of Cambyses, by whom,—in that spirit of implicit obedience to his sovereign's command, so characteristic of Persian loyalty,—the true Smerdis had long before been slain. Encouraged by the knowledge that Prexaspis had been used to deny his concern in the death of that unfortunate prince, they proposed, and he consented, that on some solemn occasion he should proclaim aloud to the people his conviction that their present ruler was the true son of Cyrus:

"The Magi, as had been agreed, convoking an assembly of the people beneath the walls of the royal palace, placed Prexaspis on a lofty tower, and called on him to address the multitude. But

[1] I. 107. sqq. [2] III. 50. sq. [3] I. 24. [4] IV. 71, 72.

his discourse was shaped in a very different manner from what he had led them to expect. Beginning with Achæmenes, the founder of the royal line of Persia, he traced its descent down to Cyrus; and after dwelling on the many and great benefits conferred by that ruler on his countrymen, he laid open the whole truth concerning the death of Smerdis, which he acknowledged having hitherto dissembled, dreading the effects of a disclosure. 'But in the present emergency he felt himself constrained by an imperious necessity to declare, that he had, too surely, in obedience to the commands of Cambyses, slain the brother of that monarch, and that the royal power of Persia was now exercised by a conspiracy of Magi.' He then, after uttering solemn imprecations on his Persian fellow-citizens, should they fail to reassert the sovereign rights of their nation and inflict vengeance on the usurpers, threw himself down headlong from the summit of the tower. Thus perished Prexaspis, a man through life and in death of high and deserved repute among his fellow-citizens." [1]

Among his narratives of the livelier ethic order may be noted the adventures of Aristeas of Proconnesus, and the nuptial hospitalities of Clisthenes of Sicyon. It is remarkable, however, that with all his lively faculty of apprehending the spirit of events or the varieties of human character, Herodotus seems to have been deficient in the sense of the comic properly so called: and several passages of his work which he himself pointedly recommends as containing good stories or clever sayings, are not only devoid of true wit, but among the most insipid of his anecdotical details.[2]

Battles.

In his descriptions of battles, Herodotus is graphic rather than precise. In some instances, as at Marathon and Salamis, he is at no pains to place the topographical features of the scene of action distinctly before his readers: in others, as at Platæa, his notices, though more detailed, hardly convey a clear

[1] III. 74. [2] IV. 144., VII. 120.

impression to the minds of those not personally acquainted with the ground. In the case of Thermopylæ, on the other hand, his description is copious and complete. Here we seem to have evidence how nearly his personal associations were connected with Athens. Writing under Attic auspices, he instinctively assumes on the part of his public a knowledge of Attic localities, or of those connected with Attica; a complete knowledge in the case of Marathon and Salamis, essentially Attic regions of high celebrity; a partial knowledge in the case of the Bœotian frontier line of Cithæron. Thermopylæ, as being to the Athenians, in common with other leading Greek states, a comparatively remote district, is minutely described.

Nor are his commentaries on the field operations of contending armies very carefully drawn up; and on some occasions leave it doubtful whether he himself rightly understood the manœuvres which he details. In his description of the battle of Marathon, for example, he gives a distinct account of the Athenian order of battle, and the subsequent movements by which the victory was gained; but his own illustrative remarks show that he had no clear apprehension of the real tactics of Miltiades. The passage is here subjoined: Marathon.

"The Athenian force on the field of Marathon was drawn up in the following manner. The line, in order to be made equal to that of the Persians, was so weakened in the centre as to be there reduced to but a few files deep; the main strength and depth of the phalanx being in the wings. On the auspices proving favourable, the Athenians charged the Barbarians at a run, the distance between the two armies being about a mile. The enemy on seeing them advance made ready to receive them, supposing them at the same time to be either mad or bent on their own destruction,

in attacking a superior force thus impetuously, unsupported by cavalry or light troops. Such was the notion of the Barbarians. But when the armies came into collision, the Athenians soon proved what manner of warriors they were. For they were the first Greeks who to our knowledge had ever yet advanced to the attack at full speed, or who had ever ventured boldly to face a Median enemy; the very name of the Medes having been hitherto a terror to the Greeks. After a long struggle the Persians broke the centre of the Athenian line, and pursued their defeated adversaries into the interior. But the Athenians and Platæans were victorious on each of the wings; when allowing the enemy to fly unmolested, they closed in upon his main body which had been successful against their own centre, and defeating it also, pursued the whole routed mass of Barbarians to the sea."[1]

Herodotus here characterises the rapid onset of the Athenians, not only as something new, but as a rare and brilliant display of martial prowess. This however is a notion quite inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the Greek art of war. Throughout the flourishing age of that art, from the days of Homer down to those of Epaminondas, the mode of attack in pitched battle esteemed both most effective in itself and the truest test of courage and discipline, was the steady advance of the phalanx in ordinary time. The impetuous rush on the enemy was considered rather as a mark of the barbarian ferocity, which trusts to rapid motion and turbulent excitement to give that effect to an onslaught which the civilised warrior secures by deliberate valour and mutual confidence. The mode of attack preferred by Miltiades requires therefore some better explanation; and the general tenor of the historian's own description supplies one so satisfactory, as to create surprise that it should have escaped both his own notice and that

[1] VI. 111. sq.

of the other historians or commentators who have treated of the battle. This explanation is to be found in the historian's previous statement, that Miltiades had greatly extended the front of his little army, to prevent its being outflanked by the superior numbers of the enemy. Had he after effecting this movement remained inactive, he would have given the Persians time to adopt in their turn what was their equally obvious tactic, a counter-extension of their flanks to restore their advantage. The policy of Miltiades therefore was to charge at once with such rapidity as should leave no time for any such counter-operation; and avoid at the same time the additional annoyance to which a more deliberate advance might have exposed him from the hostile cavalry and skirmishers.[1]

The other manœuvre by which he secured the victory, that of weakening his centre to increase the strength of his flanks, is one little in unison with the modern art of war. The mode of attack to which small bodies of well-trained troops are now accustomed mainly to trust in engaging a more numerous but less-disciplined enemy, is to break his centre, and defeat his divisions in detail. An opposite plan was here pursued by Miltiades, a plan as bold as it was successful, and evincing both his great confidence in the valour of his troops, and how justly it was bestowed.[2]

The ready concession of the supreme command to Miltiades by his patriotic colleagues on this occasion, was due doubtless to the advantage which he possessed, not only of long military experience, but of an experience gathered chiefly in wars where he was

[1] See Appendix O.

[2] See Appendix P.

either an ally or an adversary of the Persians. He was the only man in Athens who possessed this qualification; and it was no doubt his former knowledge of the comparative want of discipline in the Barbarian force that emboldened him to venture on a manœuvre, which would probably have involved his own defeat in an engagement with a body of well-trained Hellenic troops.

The misapprehension into which Herodotus has fallen regarding the details of this battle, is one hardly to be expected on the part of a man himself conversant with the art of war; nor is the general tenor of his allusions to military affairs such as to warrant the belief that he was a practised soldier. Yet his descriptions of the actual conflict or clash of arms are often very striking. His account of the skirmish between the Athenians and the Persian cavalry before the battle of Platæa [1], of the death of the Persian chief Masistius, and of the struggle for the possession of his body, is almost too vividly Homeric to admit of its being strictly authentic. Several of the adventures and exploits of the battles of Artemisium and Salamis are narrated in a very spirited manner, as is also the conflict between the usurping Magi and the Seven Persian conspirators.[2]

His language, in structure and dialect. Parallel of Homer.

15. One of the most striking features of analogy between the genius of Herodotus and that of Homer is observable in the common characteristics of their style; that term being here taken in the more restricted sense, as denoting the general tone and structure of language and phraseology. In both we admire the same unvarying perspicuity, the same unconscious

[1] IX. 20. sqq. [2] III. 76.

ease and simplicity of sentiment and expression; the same cheerful heartiness in treating the more familiar order of subjects, the same gravity and dignity in those of a more elevated character; the homely never degenerating into vulgarity, the impassioned never effervescing into bombast. Such are the attributes which procured for Herodotus the highest place among the prose models of that order of composition defined by the antients the middle or medium style; as being equally removed from turgidity and tenuity, from redundancy and meagreness; and of which Homer also ranked as the standard model in his own poetical sphere. These qualities tend the more effectually to evince the native purity of the historian's taste, that during the period in which he composed, the popular school of Greek prose literature began to be remarkable for attributes of a very different nature, for rhetorical artifice and meretricious pomp of words; defects from which some of the most excellent of his contemporaries are not exempt.

In regard to its syntactic structure, the style of Herodotus seems to have been classed by several of the antient critics as belonging to the Sententious or disjointed order, the definition of which, as distinct from the Periodic or cultivated Attic style, has been given in a previous chapter. That definition can hardly however, with propriety, be applied to the style of Herodotus. His language may with more justice be described as neither sententious nor periodic, but as preserving, in this as in other respects, a middle course, equally removed from the quaint brevity of his logographic predecessors and the artificial expansion of the Siculo-Attic school. It repre-

sents, in fact, the natural flow of words and ideas in the mind of a man of correct taste and clear intellect. Many passages, accordingly, of his work may be ranked with the more sententious of Acusilaus or Hecatæus; while as many are distinguished by the compass and rotundity, if not the artifice, of Gorgias or Thucydides. Those of the former description occur, as is natural, chiefly where such precision is in itself appropriate; as in the notices of facts or objects requiring detailed description or definition, in geographical or chronological data, and other similar cases, where a nicer subdivision of clauses conduces to a corresponding distinctness of ideas. Long periods, on the other hand, are chiefly observable in orations, or other passages where the text assumes a rhetorical turn.

This native simplicity of language may appear the more remarkable in Herodotus, when it is considered that the dialect in which he wrote was not his own but that of the Ionian colonies; an idiom distinguished by a marked difference of character from his native Doric. This, however, was not a circumstance calculated to cramp or embarrass the freedom of his style. The Ionic being, at the period when he wrote, the language of historical literature, was in so far the common property of the cultivated Greek public; and the adoption of it by a native Dorian was as natural in that age as the adoption of the Tuscan by a Venetian or Neapolitan man of letters in the present day. The dialect, however, of Herodotus cannot properly be considered as representing the spoken idiom of any Greek province; but was more or less an artificial or composite language formed, partly of

the several varieties of living Ionic, which he himself describes as prevailing in the Asiatic states in his time, partly by an admixture of Attic forms, to which his connexion with Athens had habituated him.[1] This is a process which, however foreign to the ideas or practice of the modern republic of letters, was also familiar in the literature of Greece from the time of Homer downwards.

How far this mixed Ionic dialect of Herodotus may be the particular variety of his native tongue best adapted to his own branch of composition is another question. The proper characteristics of the Ionic dialect, both in sound and structure, are certainly less favourable than those of the Attic to the treatment of the more practical branches of literature to which history belongs; and, judging from the condition in which the historian's text has reached us, his inclination would seem to have been rather to extend than to modify those characteristics. On the other hand it may be urged, that the liquid flow and sonorous rotundity of the Ionic idiom adapts itself with equal, perhaps greater effect, than the terse precision of the Attic, to the historian's own peculiar order of historical composition; to that genial fulness of epic style which pervades his narrative, and that poetical tone by which so many parts of it are distinguished.

The influence which the style of Homer has exercised on that of Herodotus is not confined to a mere general resemblance. It appears, in more palpable and tangible forms, in many passages and phrases

[1] See Appendix B.

borrowed by the historian from the poet, either to the letter, or under such slight modifications as suffice to show the source from which they are derived. In some instances these passages are of such a nature, or introduced in such a manner, as to warrant the belief that Herodotus meant them to be taken as Homeric citations or paraphrases. In other cases the mode in which they are interwoven with his text would seem to characterise them merely as the spontaneous produce of a mind habitually under Homeric influence.[1]

It has been remarked in another place, that the work of Herodotus was not probably the result of a single prolonged effort brought to bear on an already complete body of materials, but that after it had been sketched out, or had even reached a certain stage of integrity, it may have remained on the author's hands, receiving from time to time such additions or alterations as his more enlarged information or matured judgement might suggest. His text also bears internal evidence that he lived to an advanced age, and continued his labours nearly to the epoch of his death. It might therefore seem further natural to expect that different portions of a work of such bulk, and comprising so great a variety of matter, would contain evidence not only in their historical allusions but also in their style, of having been composed at different periods of their author's lifetime; and the more, when it is considered what great changes the art of prose composition underwent in the interval between the youth and old age of the

[1] See Appendix Q.

historian. But the critical analysis of his text affords little or no ground for such speculations. His style preserves, amidst all the varieties of his subject, a consistent and harmonious uniformity; evincing that by whatever process his book may have attained its existing integrity of form, it had received, in that form, in all its parts, an equal amount of careful polish from the same master hand by which it was originally designed.

Speculative modern commentators would also discover in the manner as well as the matter of the text, in the placid flow of the narrative, in the frequency and at times Nestorian diffuseness of the digressions, and in the childlike fondness for, and deference to, legendary or superstitious lore, evidence that the work was composed at an advanced period of the author's life.[1] Granting however these peculiarities to be each individually characteristic of the genial old age of such a man as Herodotus, they may yet, taken in the aggregate, and in combination with others of a bolder sterner character which also abound in his page, with better reason be regarded as reflecting the mind of the man than the time of life at which he wrote. Even apart from any such peculiarities of style or allusion, the author of a narrative treating at similar length and in equally popular vein the more interesting vicissitudes of a national history, will usually be found, where the notices of his life are scanty or fabulous, taking his place in the tradition of his country and in the fancy of his readers as an aged man. To this character he

[1] Dahlmann, § 9. p. 52.; Bähr, de Vit. et scr. Herod.; Jäger, Disputt. Herodoteæ; Smith, Dict. of Biogr. vol. ii. p. 432. 435.

appears entitled, both by the extent and variety of his knowledge, the acquirement of which implies long research and experience, and by the position he assumes as Mentor and instructor of posterity, a position recognised and justified by the permanence and popularity of his works. Here we are led once more to revert to the parallel of Homer; for whom the same essential characteristics have obtained, during nearly three thousand years, the attributes and honours of old age, in the imagination of his readers and the ideal representations of classic art.

# APPENDIX.

## APPENDIX A. (Page 28.)

### ON THE RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE OF THE ATHENIANS.

THE view here taken differs widely from that of a living historian, distinguished for his warm admiration of the Athenian democracy. Mr. Grote has pronounced one of the virtues for which Athens was preeminent above all the other Greek republics, to be her liberal treatment of men of science.[1] This opinion has been expressed in the course of his elaborate justification of the conduct of the Athenians towards Socrates; in which he discovers not so much evidence of bigotry, as of an enlightened spirit of toleration. "There was but one city, in the antient world at least," he maintains, where a man, who boldly promulgated doctrines so repugnant to the prevailing notions and feelings, would have been permitted to live and teach so long; "and that one city was Athens: in any other government of Greece he would have been quickly arrested in his career." The modern public had surely a right to expect that so sweeping an imputation on the great body of the Hellenic people would have been supported by some appeal to historical facts. No such appeal has however been made by Mr. Grote, and for the best of reasons: that every fact or evidence bearing on the subject, convincingly proves the very reverse of his dogma to be true; proves, not only that Athens was notorious for acts of wanton and bloodthirsty persecution against enlightened men and liberal doctrines, but that she was the only Greek state open to the charge of such bigotry and illiberality, either in conduct or in sentiment.

[1] Hist. of Greece, vol. VIII. p. 634. sqq. 672. sqq.

Athenian intolerance persecuted and judicially murdered Socrates; drove Plato, Euclid, and others of the most illustrious disciples of Socrates, into exile by the terror of a similar fate; fined and banished Anaxagoras, and in his absence condemned him to death; fined and banished Damon and Protagoras; persecuted Pericles, Aspasia, and Phidias; threw the latter into prison and allowed him there to languish and die; and forced Diagoras to escape by flight the result of a similar persecution with which he was menaced. Here we have some eight or ten well authenticated cases, of the best or wisest men of the age, both her own citizens and foreigners, having been slain or cruelly treated by Athens, all on the same cause or pretext, it matters not which, of their enlightened views and free expression of opinion. Several other less well attested cases might be added to the list.[1]

Mr. Grote will not find it easy to substantiate against any other Greek republic, or against the whole body of Hellenic states united, charges of intolerance approaching in number and magnitude to those above stated.[2] We question, indeed, whether a single such case can be discovered beyond the limits of Attica; and we repeat the assertion made in the text: that one of the most honourable traits in the character of the Hellenic race, with the single exception of the Athenians, was the respect paid by them to boldness and originality of opinion and doctrine in their philosophers and public teachers. Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Zeno, taught successively at Elea theories as sceptical and as repugnant to the popular prejudice and superstition as any for which Anaxagoras and Socrates suffered.[3] Were they "quickly arrested in

[1] Of Diogenes of Apollonia, see Diog. Laert. IX. 57. Of Prodicus, see Smith's Biogr. Dict. sub v.

Even before the settlement of distinguished foreign professors at Athens, the early inferior order of moral speculators, Agathocles, Pythoclides, and others, are described on high authority (Plato, Protag. p. 316.; Plut. Vit. Per. 4.), as under the necessity, for fear of the popular odium, of surreptitiously inculcating their doctrines through the medium of lessons in music and other accomplishments of which they were also professors.

[2] The case of the Pythagoreans of Croto, the only one which here occurs to us, forms no real exception; that sect being, as Mr. Grote justly observes (vol. IV. p. 542. 546.), not a harmless fraternity of speculative philosophers, but a powerful and dangerous body of political conspirators openly arrayed against the existing institutions of the republic.

[3] Grote, vol. IV. p. 521., VIII. p. 499. sqq.

their career"? All three of them passed long lives in the bosom of their native or adopted home, objects of unqualified esteem and admiration to their fellow-citizens. Empedocles not only taught at Agrigentum doctrines still stranger than those of the Eleatics, but arrogated to himself, with far greater audacity than Socrates, the credit of a divinely inspired missionary and of direct intercourse with the Deity.[1] Was he quickly arrested in his career? He was idolised as the most illustrious man and citizen of his age and country, not only by his Agrigentine fellow-townsmen, but by the whole body of Sicilian states. We hear nothing of Anaxagoras having been in any way molested on account of his moral or political opinions in his native Ionia, either before he settled at Athens, or after he was driven by Attic intolerance to return home. On the contrary, as we learn on no less authority than that of Aristotle[2], he spent the latter part of his life so greatly revered and esteemed that at his death he was decreed a public funeral, and that his memory continued in after ages to be fondly cherished at Lampsacus, his chosen place of residence. When the disciples of Socrates fled from Athens after the death of their master, Euclides, one of the most distinguished among them, took refuge in the neighbouring state of Megara. There, instead of being repelled and stigmatised as an atheist or revolutionist, he found a safe and honourable asylum, established a school, and continued to teach undisturbed during the rest of his life, the doctrines for which his master had suffered death in the only city of Greece where, Mr. Grote assures us, persons who taught such doctrines were not exposed to persecution. Here too he was joined by Plato, another refugee from Attic intolerance, who for a while assisted him in his labours, and afterwards extended his own sphere of philosophical instruction, with general applause, to Cyrene, Syracuse, and other republics. No where do we hear of Protagoras, or Prodicus, or any other member of the fraternity of "sophists," having been exposed in any Greek state but Athens to the same indignities to which those distinguished masters were there subjected. Every where but in that city, even in obtuse and ascetic Sparta, they seem to have been treated with the honours due to their genius, whatever the novelty or peculiarity of the mode in which it was displayed.

Heraclitus of Ephesus is perhaps the one among early Greek

[1] Grote, vol. VIII. p. 466.

[2] Rhetor. II. 23.

philosophers whose character offers the greatest analogy, it can hardly be called resemblance, to that of Socrates. Austere and morose in his manners, careless of the refinements or even the decencies of polite society, dogmatical as a teacher and a disputant, and open-mouthed in his contempt for the political institutions of his native city, yet this man was offered the dignity of first magistrate and legislator by the Ephesians[1], as a tribute to his talents and integrity; and when he scornfully and contumeliously refused the appointment, as a disgrace rather than an honour to a man of sense or spirit, he was allowed to follow out unmolested in his own way his own eccentric line of life and doctrine.

Had Mr. Grote therefore reversed his proposition, and asserted that Athens was the only state in Greece where Socrates would have been treated as he was treated by the Athenians; and that had he been a citizen of Agrigentum, or Megara, or Syracuse, or Ephesus, he would have been cherished and honoured as an ornament and benefactor to his country; had Mr. Grote even pronounced that all or most of the religious and political bigotry of Greece was concentrated in the Athenian democracy, and that the rest of the nation was singularly free from those defects, he would assuredly have been much nearer the truth; in so far at least as historical facts are to be regarded as tests of historical truth. But we go further, and maintain, that the most enlightened men in Athens, not perhaps even excepting Socrates himself, were tainted with the spirit common to the mass; and we do so in concurrence with Mr Grote's own opinion. We cannot indeed agree with him in all his views as to the character and influence of the Sophists; his learned investigation of that subject being marked by the defect common to many of his more elaborate researches after truth, of being carried beyond the region of truth into that of exaggeration. But we entirely agree both with his doctrine and his arguments, that the spirit in which those teachers were assailed by Plato and the other Socratics was a spirit of persecuting intolerance, different in kind no doubt, but equal in warmth and zeal, to that which led the more vulgar tribe of bigots to hunt to the death their illustrious fellow-citizen.

We should not probably have been led to enter at so great detail, in this purely incidental mode, on a question which it may

[1] Diog. Laert. in Vit. IX. 1.

be our lot hereafter to discuss in the form of principal subject, had not Mr. Grote's most unmerited panegyric on Athenian bigotry, at the expense of panhellenic liberality, been blindly acquiesced in and repeated in quarters where we should least have expected it to find favour. It would also have been paying but a bad compliment to Mr. Grote, if, in an attempt to lay before our readers a true estimate of the genius of the Attic period of literature and science, we had abstained from protesting against so false a view of the intellectual character of the Attic people, when promulgated on his high authority.

---

## APPENDIX B. (Page 116.)

### ON THE IONIC DIALECT OF HERODOTUS.

RECENT modern commentators[1] have disputed the existence of this freedom of usage in the Ionic dialect of literature, and have exerted themselves, especially in dealing with the text of Herodotus, to reduce his language to dialectical uniformity by discarding, on the one hand those idioms which savour of Atticism, on the other those usually considered proper to the old Ionic of the epic minstrelsy. These two classes of anomalous diction are assumed to have been indebted for their place in the historian's text, solely or chiefly to the later transcribers and copyists, acting under two kinds of influence. Some, it is supposed, anxious to maintain the dialectical consistency of a standard Ionian writer, have introduced into the text a number of Ionic, chiefly Homeric idioms, never actually used by Herodotus; while others, guided by the opposite tastes and habits of their own age, have substituted Attic or common Hellenic forms for the pure Ionism of the historian.

There can be little doubt that the text of Herodotus has suffered on its passage to posterity no small degree of mutilation of the nature above described. It is however to be feared, lest the mode in which it has been attempted to remedy the supposed

[1] Struve, Quæstiones de dialecto Herodoti, 1828; Dindorf, Præfat. ad Herodot. ed. Didot, 1844; Bredovius, Quæstt. critt. de dial. Herod. 1844.

mischief should prove but a substitution of one species of corruption for another. Small as may be the confidence due to the readings of the transmitted text in individual cases, it seems yet not easy to understand, how many of those dialectical forms which it is now proposed to discard, could have found place in such numbers as are observable even in the best extant manuscripts, unless there had been some primary basis of authority for the existence of a similar, though perhaps more limited amount of variety, in the more antient and genuine editions from which all those of later times are derived. Had the Alexandrian grammarians for example found the principle of dialectical uniformity here in question prevailing in the standard manuscripts which they collated, and had it been recognised and enforced by them in their own editions, as it assuredly would have been, the later race of grammarians, with that respectful deference which they were in the habit of paying to those masters, would hardly have shown so entire a contempt for their authority in the present case, as never even to have noticed the fact of any such doctrine having been inculcated by them.

But the comparative correctness of the existing text in this particular is not dependent for its vindication on merely negative evidence. We have the distinct assurance of several of the most learned and intelligent antient grammarians that the dialect of Herodotus abounded in anomalies; and this assurance is so worded as to imply that such anomalies were in whole or in greater part of the same description as those which the present school of critics would discard or correct. By those antient authorities the dialect of Herodotus, as contrasted with what they also describe as the purer more genuine Ionic, is characterised by the terms "varied" and "mixed;" which variety and mixture are further stated to consist in great part at least of poetical forms.[1] It would not be easy to define with greater general accuracy those same peculiarities which in the transmitted text of the historian it is now proposed to condemn as corruptions. We there find on the one hand an admixture of Attic, and perhaps of other provincial forms, with those defined by our modern grammarians as the

[1] Hermog. de form. Orat. II. p. 402. (ed. 1569) alibi. Compare this and similar passages both of Hermogenes and of other grammarians (ap. Bredov. p. 6.); where the peculiarity here in question is distinctly stated and illustrated.

classical Ionic; on the other hand we find an admixture of forms proper to the Homeric or poetical Ionic. If these two classes of anomaly, admitting them to be such, were to be expunged throughout the historian's text, it would not be easy to understand in what the pervading "mixture" and "variety" of dialectical and poetical diction, referred to by Hermogenes and others, could have consisted.

Among the arguments by which it has been attempted to set aside the Homeric portion of those forms, it has been urged that they bear in themselves internal evidence of having been in whole or in great part suggested to the poet or his fellow-minstrels by the exigencies of their metre; and that, by consequence, however allowable or appropriate they may be in his verse, they are improper in the text of a prose writer, who was under no such obligation to alter the customary forms of language. This argument might supply those who attach weight to it with a fair ground of censure against Herodotus, or any other prose writer who had been guilty of the imputed impropriety; but it can furnish no evidence of his having abstained from that impropriety, sufficient to counterbalance the testimony of respectable antient authors to the opposite effect. But in truth, the doctrine which would limit the influence of such metrical considerations solely to prose writers is one which, whatever force it might have in a question relative to the genius or practice of other tongues, is little if at all applicable to the antient Greek. For it is certain that, even in prose composition, the delicate ear of the Hellenes was susceptible to the nicer modifications of metrical cadence, in a degree which finds neither parallel nor analogy in the literature of the polite modern languages. It was the less to be expected that Herodotus, whose work exhibits him in every other characteristic feature of his genius or taste,—what he has been so emphatically styled by an illustrious antient critic,—the most Homeric of Greek prose authors, should have denied himself the exercise of a right conceded by the literary courtesy of his age to every great master of the art of composition,—that of seasoning his own streams of eloquence from the native common fountain head of harmonious phraseology.[1]

[1] Dindorf however p. xxv. goes the length of even more rigidly excluding the influence of such considerations of euphony in the special dialect of Herodotus. Our own study of his text has led us to the exactly op-

While nothing can be more arbitrary than the mode in which the readings of the transmitted text have by modern commentators been set aside where adverse, or adopted where favourable, to their own views, it is certain that the result of their efforts to enforce their conjectural standard of dialectical propriety would be but to introduce other incongruities or anomalies as palpable as those which it is their object to remedy. One or two examples will suffice out of numbers that might be adduced.[1]

The readings of the manuscripts are nearly equally divided between the Homeric form of the verb βοηθέειν, and the later contracted form βωθέειν. Dindorf[2] every where rejects the former and retains or substitutes the latter; on what ground is not stated. Yet in the substantive βοηθός he prefers the uncontracted form (in deference to the same manuscripts the authority of which had just before been set aside), "because it is possible the noun may have been formed differently from the verb." On another similar occasion a preference is given, on the ground of a concurrence of the transmitted readings, to the Homeric form of the substantive νοῦσος over the common Hellenic form νόσος.[3] But the manuscripts are singularly unanimous, on the other hand, in favour of the verbal form νοσέω in preference to νουσέω. One might have thought that, on the same plea to which so great importance had just been attached, of a possible difference in form between verb and substantive, the unanimity of the readings would have secured for νοσέω as good a claim to a place in the modern editor's text, as in the previous case of βωθέω and βοηθός. But on the contrary νοσέω is every where altered, and it may safely be said corrupted, into νουσέω.

If the commentators of this school are so little consistent with themselves, it were the less to be expected that they should be in very close harmony with each other. Professor Bredow of Berlin, who has devoted an octavo volume of between four and five hundred

posite conclusion; that both the historian, and the people whose dialect he had preferred to his native Doric, were peculiarly alive to such considerations.

[1] These special remarks on this new doctrine or system of Herodotean criticism, have been limited chiefly to Dindorf's commentary on the dialect of Herodotus prefixed to the text of Didot's edition; which affords the concisest summary of the views advocated by its author. The reader may also consult Bredow, op. cit.

[2] p. viii. [3] p. xi.

closely printed pages to the promulgation of this doctrine of dialectical consistency in Herodotus, lays it down as a fundamental rule at the outset of his labours[1], that the historian "never uses the same word under different dialectical forms." Yet in treating of this same verb *βοηθέω* he remarks[2] (very justly, though in the face of his own fundamental rule), that this was one of those cases where Herodotus must be assumed sometimes to have used the contracted, sometimes the uncontracted form, as suited his own taste and convenience. Elsewhere, by a similar violation of his own law, Professor Bredow admits the verb *νοέω*, on the same ground of equally divided varieties of reading, to have been sometimes conjugated by the historian in the contracted form *νώσας νώσομαι*; sometimes in the uncontracted form *νοήσας νοήσομαι*. Dindorf on the other hand every where discards the uncontracted form of this verb, and forces the contracted one upon the text; yet on other occasions, without a shadow of better evidence in favour of such an indulgence, he too concedes to Herodotus the use of such duplicate forms. It is certainly not very easy to understand why it should be such a sin in the historian to write both *νώσομαι* and *νοήσομαι*[3], when he is freely allowed by the same critic to write both *ἐμέο* and *ἐμεῦ*, *σέο* and *σεῦ*, &c.[4], *καλέουσι* and *καλεῦσι*.[5]

In p. IX. Dindorf lays down the general rule that the antepenacute adjectives in *ειος* do not admit any alteration of the diphthong in the penult syllable. Two—*ἀρήϊος* and *βασιλήϊος*—are excepted, on the ground, the validity of which is elsewhere so often repudiated, of their being authorised by epic usage; and five other words on grounds not stated. This general rule however is a few pages afterwards summarily set at nought[6]; where we find it asserted that the endings of the same antepenacute adjectives in *ειος* are habitually changed into *εος*; and some fifteen or twenty examples are adduced.

Nothing indeed can be more arbitrary than the mode in which, throughout Dindorf's dissertation, epic precedent, according to the humour in which the critic may happen to be, is at one time ad-

[1] p. 6. [2] p. 196. [3] p. VIII. XL. [4] p. XIX.

[5] p. XXIX. This passage amounts to a plain abandonment or contradiction of Dindorf's whole general argument; conceding as it does in the largest possible sense, not only to Herodotus but to the Ionian writers generally, the privilege of either writing or speaking the same words at different times in different forms.

[6] p. XVII.

duced as an argument in favour of readings; at other times as an argument against them; at others summarily dismissed as no argument at all. Thus *βασιλήϊος* and *ἠρώϊον*[1] and *Αἰνιῆνες*[2], on the ground of their being Homeric forms, are preferred to *βασίλειος* and *ἠρῷον* and *Αἰνιᾶνες*; but *βασιλῆος* and *Βορέω* and *ἀναίρεο*, and many other forms, are rejected on the ground of their being in harmony with the same Homeric usage, and *βασιλέος* and *βορεέω* and *ἀναιρέεο* &c.[3] are every where substituted, even where the MSS. are unanimous in favour of the condemned forms. How such monstrous specimens of cacophony as *κομιέεαι* and *χαριέεαι* or even as *ἀναιρέεο* or *βορεέω*[4] could be preferred by even the most determined advocate for Ionic uniformity, we find it very difficult to comprehend.

Numerous other instances might be adduced of similar inconsistency on the part of the same strenuous enforcers of uniformity against Herodotus.

In conclusion it must be repeated, that in these remarks it is by no means intended to uphold the genuine character of that copious variety of idioms which appears to be authorised by the existing codices of the historian's work, and which modern commentators would reduce to certain limited standards of uniformity. All that is here contended is, that both probability and antient authority justify the assumption that such variety reflects at least a greater or less amount of similar variety in the original text of the author. It were vain now to expect that any exact distinction will ever be drawn between that portion of the whole number of miscellaneous forms which belong to the genuine source, and those which proceed from later corruption. But the only approximation to such a result is to be sought in the old legitimate method,—in the selection and preference of the form or forms authorised by the antient manuscripts. For these data no modern editor has a right to substitute his own conjectural emendations, as has been done to so licentious an extent by the recent editors of Herodotus. And whatever corruptions remain, after that more legitimate process has been carried into effect, will, there can be little doubt, leave the text a more genuine representative of the original composition of the historian, than could result from the enforcement of those arbitrary laws of consistency by which the operations of the present school of Herodotean criticism are guided.

[1] p. x. [2] p. vii. [3] p. xi. xvi. [4] p. xxv. sq.

EUROPA
SCYTHIA
MARE CASPIUM
PONTUS
TRACIA
SINUS LIBYCUS
LIBYA
ASIA
INDIA
HECATÆI
GEOGRAPHIA

## APPENDIX C. (Page 144.)

### ON THE GEOGRAPHY OF HECATÆUS.

THE accompanying map has been framed, with some modification, upon that appended by Klausen to his edition of the fragments of Hecatæus. The names of localities conjecturally assumed by Klausen to have been borrowed by later authorities from that geographer, but without special mention of his name, have, as a general rule, been omitted; as have also those derived from the fragments of his Genealogy: the object here in view being simply to restore, in as far as possible, his geographical work. Some few names on the other hand, derived from that work, but which have been omitted in Klausen's map, have been supplied in our own.

A considerable portion of the whole number of the names in the list are unnoticed by any other antient geographer. Some of these may have become obsolete, or may represent places which themselves became insignificant or extinct after the time of Hecatæus. As however many of these unidentified sites or names belong to remote regions, or to the interior of the great continents, it is also probable that a part of them may have been inserted by the geographer on hearsay; and possibly so corrupted from the genuine native orthography, as not to be recognisable by those who afterwards extended their researches into the same countries.

The closer analysis to which, in preparing this map, we have had occasion to subject the antiquated system of geography which it represents, has the more thoroughly convinced us of the fallacy of the modern doctrine (to be further noticed in the next Appendix) that the work in which that system was embodied was the forgery of an Alexandrian bookmaker.

## APPENDIX D. (Page 149.)

### ON THE PERIODUS OF HECATÆUS.

C. MÜLLER, the most recent editor of Hecatæus, has an elaborate argument [1] to prove that both Callimachus and Eratosthenes, like the two knights who quarrelled about the colour of the black and white shield, are more or less right in their views. He supposes, either that there were two works current in those days under the title of "Periodus of Hecatæus," the one genuine the other spurious; the copy of Callimachus being spurious that of Eratosthenes genuine: or that a single work existed, partly composed of genuine Hecatæan matter, partly of garbled extracts from Herodotus, which work Callimachus had read with sufficient care to enable him to detect the fraud; while Eratosthenes, who had merely looked into it here and there, happening only to light on the genuine passages, had found no ground of suspicion. A more arbitrary or far-fetched hypothesis assuredly was never propounded by an intelligent scholar. The only foundation on which it professes to rest is the occurrence, among the 380 quotations from Hecatæus, of one or two by grammarians of a low period, in which, either owing to a blunder of the quoter or to a corruption of his text, the names of Hecatæus and Herodotus have been confounded with each other.

The details of Müller's argument are as uncritical as its substance. In the well-known text of Porphyry, where Herodotus is charged with piracy from Hecatæus, the expression *βραχέα παραποιήσας* (slightly varying) has been interpreted by this editor to denote that Herodotus "had given an abridgement" of the borrowed passages (in brevius contraxisse); and one of the strong points of Müller's case is made to rest on this blunder.

No critical reader will, it is hoped, be disposed to admit even the possibility that the most discriminating and painstaking scholar of the Alexandrian Museum, as Eratosthenes certainly was, could, in the exercise of his functions as chief librarian of that establishment, ever have been involved in so strange a game of cross-purposes with his predecessor in office, in regard to a standard national classic.

[1] In Fragg. p. xiii. xiv.

## APPENDIX E. (Page 176.)

### ON THE LYDIACA OF XANTHUS.

We have observed with some surprise that Welcker, followed by the recent editor of the fragments C. Müller, has preferred the authority of this obscure sophist to the preponderance of better testimonies enumerated in the text. The dilemma in which the argument of these modern followers of Artemon is involved at the outset goes far to confute it. As about a half of the authenticated citations of Xanthus are by Strabo, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and other authors of good credit, and contain historical details of considerable interest, both Welcker and Müller have been constrained to admit the genuine character of those extracts. The question then naturally arose: How could the genuine text of Xanthus be quoted by Strabo from Scytobrachion's supposititious work? Two modes of evading this difficulty have been proposed. The one assumes these passages to have been borrowed by Strabo at second hand from the text of earlier authors (especially of Eratosthenes) who may have had access to the genuine Lydiaca. The other assumes the spurious work of Scytobrachion to have been made up in part of genuine fragments, and that the more critical quoters of it had the discernment to limit their references to those fragments. We shall not attempt to combat in detail hypotheses so arbitrary, and resorted to in support of an equally arbitrary theory of so creditless an author as this Artemon. But what can be in itself more improbable than that a book, so highly prized in every age of Greek literature as the chief authority on its own subject, should have become so completely lost during the interval between Eratosthenes,—or rather between his pupil Mnaseas, who also quotes from it,—and Scytobrachion, as to have afforded room to the latter for the exercise of his talents in book-forgery? The lowest epoch assigned to Scytobrachion [1] is little more than half a century later than Mnaseas. That half century comprised the most flourishing period of Alexandrian bibliography; the period of all antiquity during which the greatest pains were bestowed on the preservation of such works as the Lydiaca; and is it credible that, precisely during this period, that precious volume should have been destroyed or discarded as waste paper from the library of the Museum?

[1] 150 B. C. C. Müller, in Didot, vol. II. p. 6.

One of the principal arguments of those favourable to Artemon's doctrine rests on the assumption that every passage of any later writer treating of the affairs of Lydia, unless specifically quoted from some other work, is an extract from the supposed spurious Xanthus. In this way the well-attested remains of the real Xanthus have been smothered by modern editors under a mass, nearly double their own bulk, of altogether unauthenticated matter. Such are more especially the long extracts from the Lydian history of Nicolaus Damascenus[1], all of which have been assumed most arbitrarily to be derived from the supposed spurious Xanthus, rather than from the various other authors of Lydian history such as Xenophilus, Xenagoras, Menecrates. Yet in more than one remarkable instance, in that for example of king Cambles and his gluttony, the account given by Nicolaus differed considerably from that given by Xanthus as quoted by Athenæus. The other story of the Mysian virago in frag. 8., supposed to have been borrowed from Xanthus, is to be found (a fact of which Müller does not seem to have been aware) in Herodotus, from whom it has been borrowed by Nicolaus in its entire substance, with the alteration of a name or two, such as Mysian for Pæonian, and Alyattes for Darius, to impart to it a certain novelty and originality. Conclusive proof that Xanthus is not in this instance Nicolaus's authority is to be found in the fact that the Mysians are here called Thracians, according to the ordinary opinion; whereas Strabo[2], in an authentic citation of the genuine Xanthus, mentions as one of the peculiarities of his geographical system that he maintained the Mysians to be a colony not of Thracians but of Lydians.

An argument from internal evidence has also been raised, even against the better-authenticated fragments, on the plan too popular in the modern schools, of judging antient authors in any given department by some conventional standard of uniformity, and stigmatising all the passages which reflect any eccentricity or peculiarity of individual character as corruptions or interpolations. That connexion for example between Lydian and Syrian legend, which has been recognised in our own text as an interesting evidence of the Asiatic associations of Xanthus, has been denounced by Welcker and Müller as the learned affectation of an Alexandrian sophist. With better reason might it be maintained that few things were less likely than such a system of Lydo-Phœnician mythology to

[1] Frg. 2., and Müller ad Fragg. p. 40. sqq.
[2] XII. p. 572.: conf. frg. 8.

have suggested themselves in any such quarter in a similar case. The Alexandrian mode of counterfeiting a Lydian author would rather have been to deck him out with exclusively Lydian habiliments. It happens moreover that one of the passages most broadly marked by this supposed learned subtlety— that relative to Ascalon and the Phœnician fish-goddess,—is cited by Mnaseas already mentioned, who flourished before Scytobrachion its supposed Alexandrian forger was born.

---

## APPENDIX F. (Page 208.)

### ON A PASSAGE OF ION OF CHIOS.

THE genuine character of this passage has lately been called in question[1]; first on the ground that it betrays an ignorance of the history of Ion's time, of which Ion himself could not have been guilty; secondly on account of the expression "was" applied by its author to Sophocles; which expression it is urged must allude to a person no longer in existence; nor could it therefore have ever been so used by Ion, whom Sophocles survived many years.

The first, or historical argument, the object of which is to prove that Sophocles never was at Chios under the circumstances supposed in the fragment, is more subtle than conclusive. The objection on account of the expression "was," is also oversubtle. The use of the past tense, not only in speaking of deceased persons, but in allusion to a former intercourse of the speaker with persons still alive, from whom he had either been long separated or who were resident at a great distance, is a common idiom in many languages. A classical example occurs in a fine passage of Dante, his account of his interview with Cavalcante de' Cavalcanti in the Inferno, where the latter asks him (x. v. 63.):

"Mio figlio ov' è, e perchè non è teco?
Ed io a lui: Da me stesso non vegno;
Colui, ch' attende là, per qui mi mena,
Forse cui Guido vostro ebbe a disdegno . .
Di subito drizzato gridò: Come
Dicesti: Egli ebbe? non viv' egli ancora?
Non fiere gli occhi suo i lo dolce lume?" . . . .

[1] F. Ritter, in Rhein. mus. 1843, p. 180. sqq.

But apart from this, the only evidence on which it has been assumed that Ion died in 421 B. C.—the passage of the Peace of Aristophanes concerning the "Morning Star"—is hardly in itself conclusive, as has been remarked in the text above; and if he survived that year, he may very possibly have survived both Sophocles and Euripides. There exists accordingly, in the Anthologia, an epigram "by Ion of Chios" on the death of Euripides. This composition has been summarily condemned as spurious by Bentley[1] on the supposed authority of the same passage of the Peace. But those who question the correctness of the received interpretation of that passage might be entitled in their turn to quote the epigram in further support of their opinion.

---

## APPENDIX G. (Page 245.)

### ON THE AGE OF HERODOTUS—THE REVOLT OF THE MEDES—AND AMYRTÆUS.

In the former of the passages here quoted[2], Herodotus mentions a "revolt of the Medes under Darius," and a "battle" or campaign, in which they were defeated and again brought under subjection. These notices have usually been understood to refer to the Median insurrection which took place in 408 B.C.[3], under Darius Nothus, the second Persian sovereign of the name. It has however been very reasonably objected to this view[4], that in a narrative in which the first Darius son of Hystaspis alone appears as a contemporary actor, and in every other part of which the name Darius, when introduced in this simple form without distinctive title or surname, is exclusively appropriated to him, Herodotus was not likely, in one single instance, to have applied that name in the same familiar manner to a sovereign who flourished fifty years later, and whose reign lay altogether beyond the limits of the historian's subject. It has accordingly been suggested as more likely, that the Median revolt here in question occurred in connexion with the usurpation of the Median Magus Smerdis in 521 B.C., shortly prior to the accession of Darius Hystaspis.

[1] Epist. ad Mill. p. 497.

[2] I. 130., conf. II. 140.; Thuc. I. 110. sqq.

[3] Xen. Hell. I. ii.

[4] Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. IV. p. 303. sqq.: conf. Krüger, Leb. des Thuc. p. 25. sqq.

There is certainly some difficulty in the first interpretation of the passage, the terms of which are not marked by the usual precision and clearness of Herodotus. But the other explanation of it involves equal or still greater difficulties. Had Herodotus known of any general insurrection of the Medes during the usurpation of Smerdis, or of any great battle in which they were subdued, it seems incredible that he should not only have suppressed all mention of such very important events, in the otherwise detailed narrative given by him of the same usurpation, but should have embodied that narrative in a form implying that he was totally ignorant of those events. According to his account the Magus Smerdis, backed by his brother Patizithes governor of Susa, acquired the supreme power, not as a Median rebel but in the pretended character of the true Persian prince Smerdis, the lawful heir of Cambyses; and is maintained on the throne not by any insurrection of the Medes against the Persians, but by the mass of the Persian nation itself under the conviction that he was their legitimate monarch. And far from the Median subjects of the empire having made any attempt, either forcibly to maintain him in his authority, or to resent his deposition and death, Herodotus tells us that the moment the fraud was discovered, the enraged Persians rose and wreaked a posthumous revenge on the slain impostors, by massacring during several days every one of their fellow Magi on whom they could lay their hands. Not a hint occurs to the slightest resistance on the part of the unfortunate Medes, still less to a revolt which required to be put down by a battle between them and their Persian rulers. It seems, we repeat, scarcely conceivable how Herodotus could ever have alluded to these events in the terms employed by him in the subsequent passage here in question.[1]

On the whole therefore it appears more probable that Herodotus should, on this one occasion, have applied the name Darius vaguely or carelessly in the more general sense to the Darius of his own day, than that he should have involved his narrative in the strange incongruity which would result from the other interpretation of the passage.[1]

[1] In the Behistun inscription, many provinces of the empire, that of Media included, are described as having revolted against Darius shortly after his accession. But Herodotus shows no knowledge of those transactions.

The second text[1] appealed to as evidence of the late period down to which the historian continued to write, is that where he mentions the death of the Egyptian king Amyrtæus, the same to all appearance who wrested the government of Egypt from the Persians in 414 B.C. and, after a reign of six years as first king of Manetho's 28th dynasty[2], died in the same year 408 B.C. in which took place the insurrection of the Medes under Darius Nothus. This date however has also been called in question; feebly by Wesseling and other old commentators, more vigorously of late by various modern scholars, especially by Mr. Grote[3], who disputes the fact of the Amyrtæus whose death is mentioned by Herodotus being the Amyrtæus of Manetho. The Amyrtæus of Herodotus he argues, is described by that historian as having been in active revolt against the Persians as early as the year 462 B.C.; and cannot consequently, with any reasonable probability, be supposed to be the same Amyrtæus who died king of Egypt fifty years afterwards. To this argument no great weight can attach; for, granting its validity, it would equally prove that the George the Third who succeeded to the throne of England in 1760 could not be the same George who died in 1820; or that the Louis who became king of France in 1715 was not the same Louis who died in 1774. There is no reason why personages of royal blood should not occasionally have lived seventy or eighty years in Egypt as well as in France or England; or consequently why a patriot Egyptian prince, who had gallantly but vainly fought for the national independence in early youth, say at the age of 25, might not, forty-eight years afterwards, as the result of a more successful struggle[4], have been hailed as monarch by his fellow-countrymen even at the advanced age of seventy-three, or have lived and reigned to the age of seventy-nine. The fact of his having reigned but six years may indeed be considered as an argument that he had mounted the throne at an advanced period of life. There is nothing certainly so improbable[5] in this as to render it necessary to resort to the

[1] III. 15., conf. II. 140.; Thuc. I. 112.

[2] Clinton, F. H. vol. II. pp. 46. 78. 316.; Dahlmann, Herodot. § 8. p. 45.; Bunsen, Egypten's Stelle in d. Weltgesch. Bd. II. p. 150.

[3] Hist. of Greece, vol. IV. p. 306.

[4] That the struggle was renewed whenever opportunity offered during the interval appears from Thucydides, I. 112.

[5] That Herodotus was conscious of no such improbability is clear from one of the passages (II. 140.) in which he mentions Amyrtæus. He there describes another earlier Egyptian king Sethos as having, much in the

somewat hackneyed expedient preferred by Mr. Grote, of assuming two Amyrtæi, one for Herodotus another for Manetho. Of such a duplicate Amyrtæus there is no trace in the allusions of either Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus, or other authors who treat of the history of this time. Had there been two, the absence of all such notice were the more surprising, that both would certainly have been, each in his own sphere of influence, a very remarkable personage. For Herodotus tells us that "no man ever inflicted greater evils on the Persians" than his Amyrtæus; while the Amyrtæus of Manetho wrested from the same Persians the sceptre of Egypt, which they had wielded for upwards of a century. Nor indeed can the strong language used by Herodotus to characterise the anti-Persian influence of his Amyrtæus, be considered as justified merely by his performances in the first part of his career, though perfectly appropriate in its application to the long-continued and finally successful struggle of the hardy old veteran against the alien dynasty.

Herodotus in the same passage[1] describes "Paüsiris, the son of Amyrtæus, as having received from the Persian monarch the sovereignty of his father, according to the usual Persian policy of allowing the sons even of rebellious vassals to retain their paternal dominions, where they willingly gave in their allegiance to the supreme government." This will account for the circumstance that with Manetho, the native Egyptian annalist, the dynasty of Amyrtæus the Saite ends with himself. Manetho would naturally exclude from his list of independent Egyptian sovereigns one who had placed himself in the position of a mere satrap of the Persian emperor. Accordingly, setting Paüsiris aside altogether, he begins a new dynasty, the 29th, with another, Mendesian, king. This passage of Herodotus affords also a further argument that the Amyrtæus of Manetho and of Herodotus are the same. For it is certain that the government of Egypt was never given by the Persians to an Egyptian vassal king during the previous period.[2]

same way as Amyrtæus, been driven to take refuge in the fens, as having remained there fifty years in concealment, and as having at the end of that period succeeded in obtaining and keeping possession of the throne.

[1] III. 15.

[2] Since the above was written, the author has been gratified to find that the opinion of his valued friend the Chev. Bunsen,—perhaps the highest living authority on any such question,—relative to the Amyrtæus of Herodotus and his age, coincides in all material points with that here expressed.

Mr. Grote further argues, with some plausibility, that had Herodotus continued to live and write his history as late as has here been supposed, he would hardly, in alluding to the Greek national disasters assumed by him to have been portended by the earthquake at Delos in 490 B. C., have restricted them to those which occurred "in the reigns of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes," 521—423 B. C., to the exclusion consequently of the great Athenian catastrophe before Syracuse, which occurred in 413 B. C. This argument might have some weight in the case of ordinary writers of history, but has none in the particular case of Herodotus. In that spirit of methodical subtlety, which he every where exhibits in the adjustment of his theory of divine dispensation, as fully illustrated in Chapter VI. of our own text, three generations of calamity would abundantly suffice for one prodigy. The disasters of Syracuse or of Ægospotamoi would possess special claims to some special portent for their own behoof. As a parallel case may be adduced the pains he takes to assure us, that the destruction of Athens and devastation of Attica by Xerxes were not judgements on the Athenians for their murder of the Persian ambassadors, but for some other offence or impiety which he has not vouchsafed to mention.

Mr. Grote's objections[1] to the view here preferred all proceed on the general ground, that "the supposed mention by Herodotus of a fact so late as 408 B. C. perplexes the whole chronology of his life and authorship." "According to the usual statement of his biography, which every one admits, and which there is no reason to call in question, he was born in 484 B. C. Here there is an event alluded to in his history, which occurred when he was seventy-six years old." That Herodotus should have continued to write his history down to an advanced stage of his life, were nothing improbable in itself; and many of the best and most critical of his commentators have, in fact, been led by the internal evidence of his own text to the opinion (in which we do not altogether concur), that the whole work was composed in the old age of the author. But as to what Mr. Grote calls the "usual statement of his biography which every one admits, and which there is no reason to call in question," it amounts to nothing more we apprehend than the statement of Pamphila, the intrinsic value of which we deny altogether.[2] Her statement is proved to be false in the case of Hellanicus by an extant passage of his works, and admitted to be so by Mr. Grote himself in a note to p. 617. of his

[1] p. 405.

[2] Supra, p. 217. note 7.

sixth volume. He need have very little scruple therefore in discarding her testimony, if necessary, in the case of Herodotus.

Another argument which here suggests itself of the late period at which Herodotus died, is the circumstance, that the unanimous judgement of the antient critics of every period made him junior to Hellanicus. The latter historian therefore being ascertained upon his own evidence to have been still engaged in writing in 406 B.C., it follows, unless we altogether reject antient testimony on the subject, inclusive even of that of Pamphila, that Herodotus must have outlived the year 408 B.C.

---

## APPENDIX H. (Page 265.)

### ON THE OLYMPIC LECTURE OF HERODOTUS.

THE principal objections to the credibility of Lucian's legend have been forcibly stated by Dahlmann; and many of the points on which he dwells are substantially those to which prominence has been given in the text above. But while there is this similarity in the object there is some difference in the method of the two arguments. Our able predecessor appears to have weakened his case, by too great a deference to other traditions concerning Herodotus possessing little better claim to authenticity than that of the Olympic lecture. He adopts for example implicitly, with Larcher and other commentators of the old school, the precise dates assigned by Pamphila to the nativities of Herodotus and Thucydides. He also acquiesces in the view of those commentators, as to an original connexion between the Olympic legend of Herodotus as a lecturer, and that of Thucydides as a listener; which two assumptions involve a third, that the lecture, if it took place at all, must have taken place, as Larcher had laid down, in 456 B.C.; in the 28th year of the historian's age, and in the 16th of that of Thucydides. Accordingly, against these combined hypotheses and the chronological improbabilities which they involve, the whole strength of Dahlmann's argument has been directed. Lucian however betrays no knowledge of the share in the Olympic lecture assigned by the Byzantine writers to Thucydides; the later origin of which legend may, on grounds stated in our own text, safely be assumed. Nor is there any reason to believe that Lucian's opinion as to the relative chronology of the two historians,—assum-

ing him to have had any opinion on the subject, — coincided with that of Pamphila. Dahlmann's chronological arguments therefore, however valid against Larcher, are of no force against Lucian, nor consequently against those adherents of Lucian [1] who place a less implicit reliance than Dahlmann on Pamphila's dates. These defects of Dahlmann's method may be illustrated by his argument on the passage of Herodotus relative to the skulls on the battle-field of Papremis. That passage, he observes [2], "proves that the historian's visit to Egypt did not take place until after 456 B. C., and consequently, that in that year, in which" (according to Larcher and Dahlmann's theory) "he is represented as reciting his description of Egypt at Olympia, he had not yet set foot on the shores of the Nile." Here there are two fallacies. For in the first place the account of Lucian, leaving out of the question Pamphila's dates for which he is no way responsible, may apply to any Olympic year prior to 444 B. C. in which the historian settled at Thurium; and in the second place, it is very probable that Herodotus may have visited Egypt more than once.

Our own argument against Lucian has been restricted to the only ground on which he can fairly be assailed; by excluding from it all other traditions concerning Herodotus but such as can advance solid pretensions to be better attested than Lucian's own Olympian anecdote.

---

## APPENDIX J. (Page 409

### ON THE SELF-CONTRADICTIONS OF HERODOTUS.

In order to avoid an undue accumulation of such details in our main text, we have reserved for this note a few other specimens of this curious kind of "Homeric" self-contradiction.

Herodotus, at the commencement of his work, tells us that Crœsus king of Lydia was the first who, by formal acts of aggression against the Greeks of Asia minor, provoked that spirit of international hostility between the Hellenic and oriental races which ultimately led to the invasion of Greece by Darius and Xerxes. Yet immediately afterwards he describes, in much detail, a previous succession of similar acts of violence against the same

[1] Krüger for example, Leben d. Thucyd. p. 32. [2] § 13. p. 68.

Hellenic colonists; invasions of their territory, sieges and sacks of their cities, &c., as habitually carried on by the predecessors of the same Crœsus; by Alyattes, Sadyattes, Ardys, and Gyges. What he means probably, and afterwards says, is, that Crœsus was the first who reduced the Hellenic commonwealths to a permanent state of vassalage. But the expressions used in I. 5. are quite inconsistent with the descriptions given in I. 14. sqq. Nor can the charge, even as against the Lydian monarchs generally, be reconciled with the historian's account of the previous piratical invasion and occupation of large portions of Lydia and the neighbouring countries by the Ionian emigrants.[1] In the face of these notices, with what justice can the Lydian kings be stigmatised as first aggressors, for endeavouring by all means in their power to subdue or expel the descendants of those original usurpers.

When Crœsus was preparing to make war on Cyrus, one of his councillors endeavoured to disuade him by pointing out the inequality of the stakes at issue between him and his adversary; that while he had every thing to lose in case of defeat, being the most prosperous monarch of his time, the Persians were a race of needy adventurers, from a victory over whom he would derive no advantage whatever. Upon which Herodotus adds his own comment: that "before their conquest of Lydia the Persians were strangers to all the good things of life." He here forgets, for the sake of a momentary effect of contrast, not only that the Persians had already conquered the great and wealthy empire of the Medes, but that he had himself described Cyrus, when bent on that conquest, as encouraging his countrymen to undertake it, by pointing out the great abundance of the "good things of life" which it would secure them.[2]

In book VI. 121. Herodotus expresses his surprise at the report which had gone abroad, of a conspiracy to betray Athens to the Persians after the battle of Marathon having been set on foot by the Alcmæonidæ, — "a family who," he adds, "had hitherto been more distinguished for their hatred of tyrannical government than even Callias son of Phænippus, who alone among the Athenians, during the temporary expulsion of Pisistratus from the city, had ventured to become a purchaser of the confiscated property of that usurper." Compare this statement with the historian's previous account[3] of the mode in which, on that same occasion,

[1] I. 146. [2] I. 71.: conf. 126. 207. [3] I. 61.

Megacles, chief of this very family of Alcmæonidæ, had been the instrument of reestablishing the expelled tyrant in his despotic power on condition of his espousing the daughter of his renegade confederate; the same renegade who here with his whole race is lauded by Herodotus as the unflinching friend of constitutional liberty.

In book II. 103. 110. Sesostris is described as having conquered the Scythians. But in book IV. 46. the same Scythians are glorified, —in the time of Darius,—as being not only hitherto unconquered, but as altogether invincible.

In book I. 70. Herodotus mentions a bronze cup, sent by the Spartans to Crœsus in the last year of his reign, as having been intercepted and seized at Samos on its passage to Sardis, just about the time when Crœsus was defeated and dethroned by Cyrus. In III. 48. he describes a present of 300 eunuchs, sent by Periander of Corinth to king Alyattes father of Crœsus, as having been also intercepted at Samos on their passage, "about the same time when the Spartan cup was plundered in the same island." At this rate, the last year of the reign of Crœsus must have coincided with some part of the reign of his father and predecessor who died fifteen years before.

In book V. 40. Anaxandrides king of Sparta is said, in marrying two wives,—the first married being childless,—to have committed "an act very contrary to Spartan custom and feeling." Yet soon afterwards (VI. 61. sq.) we find the possession of two wives by king Ariston alluded to without comment, as a matter of ordinary usage; and in the sequel he is described, also without censure or remark, as marrying a third, the other two being still both living, but childless, as in the case of Anaxandrides.

---

## APPENDIX K. (Page 419.)

### ON THE MYTHICAL DETAILS OF THE BATTLE OF THERMOPYLÆ.

No notice has been taken in the text above of the 400 Thebans, also said by Herodotus to have formed part of the force detained by Leonidas in the Pass; neither their presence nor their performances having any bearing whatever on the question there more im-

mediately at issue. It has however been justly remarked by Mr. Grote[1], that the historian's account of their share in the campaign of Thermopylæ is one of the few points on which Herodotus has been successfully attacked by the Pseudo-Plutarch. They are represented by the historian as having been detained by Leonidas against their will when he dismissed the bulk of his army, from his knowledge of their Persian partisanship, and with a desire to put their assumed zeal for the patriotic cause to the same test to which his own men and the Thespians had voluntarily subjected themselves. It is difficult to say which of the improbabilities were here the greatest: that Leonidas should have been influenced by any such motive to keep the Thebans; or that the Thebans, aware of his reason, and of the fate to which they were destined, should have tamely acquiesced in his orders. A body of Bœotian men at arms, however disaffected to the national cause, were assuredly no cowards; and would rather have fought their way home in such a case even through a line of Spartan enemies, than have quietly remained to be butchered by Persian friends. But even had they remained, must it not have further occurred to Leonidas himself, that the natural course for them to have taken, and in such an emergency a perfectly justifiable course, would have been,—the moment the action commenced,—to have joined the Persians in their assault on the Spartan and Thespian troops? The result however is described by the historian as different, and his description does but accumulate improbability on improbability. Towards the close of the action, when the Spartans and Thespians were nearly all slain, the Thebans, he tells us, crossed over to the Persians, begged for quarter, and their lives were spared. Up to this moment however he describes them as having fought, like their countrymen, against the Persians. If so, they were certainly the simplest and most disinterested body of traitors to a national cause of whom record has been preserved. But although they fought, it does not appear that any of them were killed, as well because no mention occurs of their bodies in the sequel, as from the historian's own limitation of their loss to some half-dozen men whom the Persians slew by mistake on the advance of the phalanx to beg for quarter. We are thus called on to believe that of three battalions, all engaged on the same narrow spot of ground, and during the same space of time, with an overwhelming number of adversaries, while two of them

[1] Hist. of Gr. vol. v. p. 122.

had been entirely cut to pieces, the third escaped without any loss whatever. It is impossible to reconcile these strangely improbable and discordant statements with each other or with historical truth.

Mr. Grote, while deferring to the authority of Herodotus in regard to the presence of the 400 Thebans in the Pass, adopts the tradition of Diodorus, which represents Thebes as divided at the time of the Persian war between two factions,—one favourable to the patriotic cause, the other to Xerxes; and the former as sending the contingent of 400 men to Thermopylæ.[1] But he overlooks the further statement of the Sicilian author (perhaps the most probable part of his account), that the same Theban force was not present at the final catastrophe of the Pass, having been dismissed with the other Greeks by Leonidas. Mr. Grote assumes further, in opposition to both Herodotus and Diodorus, that the zeal of the 400 for the national cause had induced them voluntarily to remain; but that when the struggle between life and death was brought fairly home to them, they lost heart and submitted to the Persians. Little weight can in any case attach to such conjectural attempts to patch up the anomalies and self-contradictions of popular Greek tradition. But this hypothesis, even judged upon its own merits, has its own share of improbability. It is certainly not very credible that a body of warriors, who were dastardly enough to betray their comrades and desert to the enemy at the last crisis of a great and brilliant action, should, a few hours before, when free to return home with the main body of the national army, have had desperation enough deliberately to prefer the alternative of self-immolation. But the story of the two parties in Thebes, one for the Greeks the other for the Medes, each so strong and independent as to have an army at its disposal, is itself an unauthenticated legend, of which no trace exists but in the apocryphal page of the Sicilian compiler. The Thebans themselves evidently knew nothing of it in the time of Thucydides, who introduces them in their own elaborate apology for their "Medism," never denying their defection to have been general, but merely excusing it on the ground of coercion by the dominant oligarchy. Had there been in the state at the time a patriot party strong and zealous enough to send 400 hoplites to the confederate force in spite of that oligarchy, the Theban orator at Platæa would not have failed to make the most of the circumstance in his harangue.

[1] p. 123.

The authority of Herodotus therefore remains good as to the general course of Bœotian policy during the war. So long as central Greece remained in possession of the national forces, the Thebans, ashamed or afraid to desert, affected cooperation, even to the extent of sending their share of troops to defend its frontier. But when the same district was occupied by the invaders, the Thebans at once joined them. The only sound inference to be drawn from the many exaggerated or conflicting stories above recapitulated relative to the affair of Thermopylæ, and from others that might be collected from standard authors of every period of antiquity, is: that all or most of the details transmitted of that celebrated action, beyond the substantial fact of a large body of Spartans and other Greeks having perished in defence of the Pass, are,—like the details of the battle of Thyrea[1], or the synchronism of the battles of Salamis and Himera, of Platæa and Mycale[2],—no better than popular fables. In addition to the discrepancies of statement above examined, it need hardly be mentioned that the account given by Diodorus[3], "Plutarch,"[4] and Justin[5], of the affair of Thermopylæ differs altogether from that of Herodotus. According to them Leonidas and his men fell, not in open battle in the Pass itself, but in a murderous midnight assault on the Persian camp. Diodorus again limits the numbers of the Greek forlorn hope,—variously rated by Herodotus in one place at 1000, in another at 4000,—to 500; 300 Spartans and 200 Thespians. Pausanias[6], while also excluding the Thebans, adds 80 Mycenians of whom Herodotus knows nothing; and Justin[7] (or rather Trogus) limits the exploit to Leonidas and his Spartans alone. It has been customary with modern writers, and naturally enough, to dismiss these later accounts as valueless, compared with the graver authority of the "Father of history." There can however be no doubt that they too rested on older more nearly contemporaneous data; and considering how improbable and self-contradictory the version of Herodotus is in all its details, his prior title to credit becomes, in this particular instance, to say the least, extremely defective.

[1] Supra, p. 328.

[2] Herodot. VII. 166., IX. 100. Diodorus (XIII. 62.) substitutes Thermopylæ for Salamis!

[3] XI. 10. [4] De Malig. Her. 32. [5] Lib. II.

[6] X. XX. 1. [7] Loc. cit.

## APPENDIX L. (Page 422.)

### ON THE WALLS OF BABYLON.

Mr. Grote however (here quoted, loc. sup. cit.) has no difficulty in accepting in its integrity the account of Herodotus; and vindicates his belief by an appeal to the Chinese wall, which he describes as "1200 English miles in length, from 20 to 25 feet in height, and wide enough for six horses to run abreast." The analogy is not very apparent between such a line of frontier rampart, averaging about 22½ feet of cubic dimensions, and two city walls each 337 feet high, 60 miles long, and from 50 to 75 feet broad. The grandeur of the Chinese work consists certainly not so much in its own bulk, as in the great extent of the frontier line which it protected. But the parallel between the two fails as entirely in regard to bulk as to general character. The above figures give for the whole of the outer Babylonian wall an amount of gross cubic dimensions more than double that of the whole Chinese wall; and taking the inner line of Babylonian wall at little more than one half the size of the outer one, the dimensions of the two together would be from three to four times those of the Chinese structure. Mr. Grote, in order to add force to his illustration, remarks that the Chinese wall "contains more materials than all the buildings of the British empire put together." At this rate the walls of Babylon must have contained from three to four times as much masonry as all the buildings of the British empire; — a consequence which certainly does not tend to increase our faith in the numbers of Herodotus. It is to be presumed that Mr. Grote has here used the phrase "British empire" inadvertently for British islands. Otherwise, taking the expression in the literal sense, the statement it affirms may be pronounced still more wildly extravagant than the historian's account of the Babylonian fortification. The substitution of "islands" for "empire" would diminish the exaggeration of the statement, but would be far from reducing it within the bounds of credibility.

## APPENDIX M. (Page 468.)

### ON THE HYPOTHESIS THAT THE HISTORY OF HERODOTUS IS AN UNFINISHED WORK.

THERE can be no better proof of the blindness to the higher principles of epic composition with which the disciples of the Wolfian school of criticism continue to be afflicted, than the fact, that several very able modern commentators of Herodotus have pronounced his history an unfinished work, even in respect to its main narrative; and have insisted that his original plan comprised, or ought to have comprised, a further sequel of events, such as would have been destructive of that unity which now constitutes its fundamental excellence.[1] Had the historian continued his subject beyond the return of the Athenian fleet to the Piræus, as these critics have suggested; had he undertaken to record the transactions narrated by Thucydides in his introductory chapter; the rise of fresh heart-burnings betwixt Athens and Sparta; the insidious attempts of the latter state to obstruct the measures of the Athenians for the restoration of their country to its former prosperity; and the fresh naval armaments fitted out by the Confederacy against the Persians, — we should have been embarked in an entirely new career of historical adventures, which Herodotus would assuredly perceive to be beyond the just limits of his undertaking, as instinctively as Thucydides has recognised in them an appropriate introduction to his history of the Peloponnesian war. The only evidence adduced in support of this doctrine is a passage of the seventh book[2], in which the historian promises to direct the reader's attention in the sequel to a transaction beyond the limits of his present narrative; but of which transaction no further mention is made in the existing text. A more reasonable

[1] There is no obvious reason, says O. Müller (Hist. of Gr. Lit. p. 269.), why Herodotus should have carried down the war between the Greeks and the Persians to the taking of Sestos, without mentioning any subsequent event. This opinion however, strange to say, he contradicts — but without retracting it, in a note to the same page; where the taking of Sestos is very properly characterised as a "distinctly marked epoch." Conf. Dahlmann, Herodot. III. § 9. p. 48., IX. § 37. p. 217.; Smith, Dict. of Herodotus, pp. 432. 434.

[2] VII. 213.

inference would be that Herodotus, who in so many other instances has noticed prospectively, or in the way of episode, matters extraneous to his immediate subject, has in this single instance, after promising further information forgotten to fulfil his engagement.

---

## APPENDIX N. (Page 494.)

### ON THE AWARDS OF MARTIAL ARISTIA BY THE GREEK CONFEDERACY.

THE principle on which the awards of Aristia, or preeminent valour, were bestowed by Herodotus, or by Greek public opinion, appears to have been the same narrow Spartan principle which dictated the useless sacrifice of valuable lives at Thermopylæ; account being taken, not so much of the aggregate excellence of the several combatants, as of the degree of desperation displayed in the hand to hand conflict with the foe. From the commencement of the operations before Platæa[1] to the close of the battle, the conduct of the Athenians is described by Herodotus as not only in all respects blameless, but as distinguished by brilliant courage combined with strict discipline. During the retrograde movement from Gargaphia to Oeroe, while the fortunes of Greece were being placed in jeopardy by the dogged insubordination of a Spartan chief of battalion[2], the Athenians were steadily following out the combined movement; their share in the execution of which was peculiarly hazardous, exposing them to the much dreaded assaults of the Persian horse, the only very efficient portion of the enemy's force; while the Spartan march, being over the declivities of Cithæron, was free from that annoyance.[3] The Athenians, in the battle itself, were opposed to the Thebans and other Helleno-Persian troops, an enemy more than five times their own number, and in themselves unquestionably far more formidable than the native Persians, the tumultuous barbarism of whose attacks, as described by Herodotus, rendered them an easy conquest to any well disciplined body of Hellenic warriors. The old and bitter hatred of the Thebans against the Athenians insured, on the other hand, as we also learn from the historian, a determined resistance

[1] See especially IX. 20. sqq. [2] IX. 53. [3] IX. 56.

on the part of the former.[1] Even after the enemy was driven from his position the victory remained undecided, as Herodotus pointedly tells us, until secured by the superior conduct of the Athenians; Spartan ferocity having been altogether at fault in its efforts to storm the fortified camp of the enemy, which was carried at once by the Attic troops.[2] Yet, in the face of all these facts, not only is the award of superior valour bestowed on Sparta, but the same Amompharetus, who at the most critical moment of the action had risked the fortune of the battle by an act of mischievous and insolent disobedience, for which a modern lieutenant-colonel might have been shot or cashiered,—because he happened to fall fiercely fighting in the subsequent onslaught, is numbered among the four warriors to whom the highest honours of the victory were awarded.

---

## APPENDIX O. (Page 511.)

### ON THE ATHENIAN CHARGE AT THE BATTLE OF MARATHON.

Mr. Grote[3] supposes the object of this rapid charge to have been, to prevent, by an instantaneous attack, the disunion and distraction which the partisans of Hippias were endeavouring to create in the minds of the Athenian citizens. Whether he means the citizens left behind in the town, or the citizen soldiers drawn up on the field, is not specified. In either case it is not easy to see how, after the attack was once resolved on, the difference of some five or ten minutes between the time required for charging a mile at a run and that required for the same advance at quick march, could have appeared to Miltiades so pregnant with momentous political consequences, as to have led him to prefer a mode of assault which, as Mr. Grote further assumes, instead of securing the victory involved serious risk of defeat. That Miltiades, in spite of his apprehensions as to the state of factions in the city, was in no hurry to bring on the action, whatever may have been the ultimate velocity of his attack, is evident from the previous statement of the historian: that after the other Attic generals had consented to devolve on him their share in the common right of exercising the

[1] IX. 67. [2] IX. 70. [3] Hist. of Gr. vol. IV. p. 474. sqq.

supreme command each in turn on successive days, he had, in order to escape all risk of blame at home, delayed the action for several days until his own proper turn came round.

Mr. Grote, however, in the face of this statement, has assumed[1], for behoof of his own theory, that Miltiades fought the battle immediately after the resolution of his colleagues to waive their privilege in his favour. Nor is it easy to reconcile Mr. Grote's pointed description[2] of Athens "as one and indivisible" at the epoch of this battle, "instead of disunited, and torn into armed factions as she had been forty years before," with his subsequent hypothesis that the same battle was in danger of being lost, or never fought, through the machinations of the Pisistratid faction in the city to effect an armed junction with the Persian force.[3]

---

## APPENDIX P. (Page 511.)

### ON A POINT OF GREEK MILITARY TACTICS.

It appears from the accounts both of this battle, and of others fought by the Greeks during their flourishing age, that the Hellenic commanders attached greater importance to the strength of their flanks than to that of their centre, and had little notion of the value of the opposite system of bringing the main attack to bear on the centre of the enemy's line. The best troops were stationed in the wings, and the critical turn of the action depended mainly on the efforts of the two lines to outflank each other.[4] This was the defect of the Lacedæmonian tactics, which when met by the improved system of Pelopidas and Epaminondas involved the defeat of the Spartan armies by those generals. The great battle of Mantinea is pointedly described by Xenophon[5] as having been gained by the modern manœuvre of breaking the line. The Macedonian phalanx was also formed on the principle of concentrating the weight of the attack on a particular point of the enemy's front; so much so as to have been somewhat unwieldy, and hence unable to withstand the still more improved science of the Romans.

[1] Hist. of Gr. vol. IV. p. 463. [2] p. 452. [3] p. 462. 475. sqq.
[4] Thucyd. v. 71. [5] Hellen. lib. VII. in fine.

The Persians seem to have had no fixed rule. At Marathon their best troops were posted in the centre; at Platæa they were on the flanks; a change dictated perhaps by their fatal experience of the Greek tactics in the former battle.

---

## APPENDIX Q. (Page 516.)

PARALLEL PHRASES IN HERODOTUS AND HOMER.

| | HERODOTUS. | HOMER. |
|---|---|---|
| I. | 14. *οὐδὲν γὰρ μεῖζα ἔργον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλο ἐγένετο.* | Il. ε. 303., η. 444.; Od. τ. 92., χ. 408., alibi. |
| | 27. *αἳ γὰρ τοῦτο θεοὶ ποιήσειαν.* | Odyss. υ. 236., ο. 536. |
| | 45. *οὐ σύ μοι . . . αἴτιος, ἀλλὰ θεῶν κού τις . . .* | Il. γ. 164.; Od. α. 347., λ. 558. |
| | 87. *τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ἐπικαλεόμενον, εἴ τί οἱ κεχαρισμένον. . . . . .* | Il. α. 39. |
| | 168. *κτίσας οὐκ ἀπώνητο, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Θρηϊκων. . . .* | Od. λ. 323., π. 120., ρ. 293.; Il. ρ. 25. |
| | 188. *πολλαὶ κάρτα ἅμαξαι τετράκυκλοι ἡμιόνειαι.* | Il. ω. 189. 266. 324.; Od. ζ. 72., ι. 241. |
| II. | 22. *γέρανοι, φεύγουσαι τὸν χειμῶνα.* | Il. γ. 3. sqq. |
| | 104. *νοήσας δὲ πρότερον αὐτὸς ἢ ἀκούσας ἄλλων.* | Od. γ. 93., δ. 324, θ. 491. |
| | 138. *δένδρεα οὐρανομήκεα.* | Od. ε. 239. |
| III. | 14. *ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ.* | Il. χ. 60., ω. 487.; Od. ο. 347. alibi. |
| | „ *δακρύειν μὲν Κροῖσον, δακρύειν δὲ Περσέων τοὺς παρεόντας . . . αὐτῷ τε Καμβύσῃ ἐσελθεῖν οἶκτον . . .* | Od. δ. 184. |
| | 34. *τὸν ἐτίματε μάλιστα.* | Il. β. 21., π. 146. |
| | 36. *ἀλλ' οὔτι χαίρων . . .* | Od. δ. 93. |

| HERODOTUS. | | HOMER. |
|---|---|---|
| III. | 36. ἐμοὶ δὲ πατὴρ σὸς Κῦρος ἐνετέλλετο πολλὰ κελεύων. | Il. ε. 528., ι. 252. 179., ρ. 356.; Od. γ. 267. alibi. |
| | 81. χειμάῤῥῳ ποταμῷ ἴκελος. | Il. ε. 88. |
| | 135. καὶ ἅμα ἔπος τε καὶ ἔργον ἐποίεε. | Il. τ. 242. |
| VI. | 23. μισθὸς δέ οἱ ἦν εἰρημένος. | Il. θ. 524. |
| | 66. ὑστέρῳ μέντοι χρόνῳ ἀνάπυστα ἐγένετο ταῦτα. | Od. λ. 274. |
| | 84. ζωρότερον πιέειν. | Il. ι. 203. |
| | 130. παιδὸς τῆς ἐμῆς μνηστῆρες. | Od. α. 368., δ. 321. |
| VII. | 17. ὄνειρον . . . . ὑπερστὰν τοῦ Ἀρταβάζου. | Il. β. 20.; Od. δ. 803., alibi: conf. supra, Vol. I. p. 491. |
| | 158. οὕτω δὴ Γέλωνος μνῆστις γέγονε. | Od. ν. 280. |
| | 159. ἤ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειεν ὁ Πξλοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων. | Il. η. 125. |
| VIII. | 8. λέγεται . . . ψευδέσι ἴκελα. | Od. τ. 203. |
| IX. | 100. φήμη τε ἐσέπτατο ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον. | Frag. Homeric. ap. Æschin. Tim. ed. Reisk. p. 141. |

To which may be added the Homeric or poetical terms ζωάγρια, III. 36.; πρόῤῥιζος, I. 32., III. 40.; δυσχείμερος, IV. 28.

END OF THE FOURTH VOLUME.

LONDON:
SPOTTISWOODES and SHAW,
New-street-Square.

00029873

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 20 February, 2016